MAXIMIZING USE OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES

IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH:

A SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL OPINION

By

Harris Reed Green

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1971

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

MAXIMIZING USE OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES
IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH:
A SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL OPINION

By

Harris Reed Green

August, 1971

Chairman: Dr. C. L. Durrance
Major Department: Curriculum and Instruction

The purpose of this study was to survey certain public and private
senior high school English teachers, supervisors of English and English
Education professors in Florida, as to the "practicability" and "feasibility"
of community oriented English instruction. The model given for this kind
of curriculum was the Parkway Program of the Philadelphia school system,
where the students spend most of their school time taking "institutional"
courses from business and professional people employed by the various
industrial, commercial and cultural institutions in that city.

Because the city of Philadelphia is so large and has so many
cultural assets, it was decided that only those school systems in those
counties with the largest cities would be included in the survey. Deter-
mination of these areas was made by consulting recent Bureau of the
Census reports, which disclosed that the largest cities (50,000
population or more) are located in Alachua, Broward, Dade, Duval,
Escambia, Hillsborough, Leon, Orange, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Santa Rosa

and Seminole counties. These last two were included because they are recognized as having close socioeconomic ties with Escambia and Orange counties, respectively, thereby constituting "standard metropolitan statistical areas" (S.M.S.A.) with them (Bureau of the Census term). Although not included in an S.M.S.A., like all the other counties, Brevard County was included because of the rich cultural resources it has at Cape Kennedy.

A two-page questionnaire describing community oriented English and asking for a series of judgements about it was constructed. Specifically, the questionnaire asked first if such a program could be implemented profitably in the opinion of the respondent; second, for those who thought it could, it asked for judgements of a list of educational properties and practices, as to which would be most or least important to the success of such an English program; third, it asked for an opinion as to how the program would be received by the community.

The results show that all groups—teachers, supervisors and professors—do think community oriented English is practicable, and do think their respective communities would respond favorably to such a program. The educational factors considered by the total group to be most important to the success of community oriented English were "flexible scheduling" and "a highly flexible school program." Those considered least important include "computer scheduling and record keeping" and "special school plant facilities," the first of these being the choice of three groups, the second of one.

It was suggested that the positive response to the curriculum concept, together with the rejection of the two properties which

could be suggestive of bureaucratic regimentation, might indicate a less defensive attitude toward traditional schooling than one would expect.

The vote of confidence given to the likelihood of community interest in such a program, coupled with the strong rejection of the idea of community partnership, suggests an attitude on the part of the respondents that the use of community resources would be just another educational technique; and the participating citizenry, just a commodity to be used at the discretion of qualified, professional educators.

It is recommended that this apparent disparagement of the lay citizenry as fellow educators be reconsidered, for their educative influence is far greater than that of professionals, and should therefore be made to work for the purposes of education rather than against them. This cooperation can be promoted in the English curriculum by having students be responsible for setting up and maintaining a communication structure between the community and the school. The teacher's role would be that of "midwife" and "facilitator."

Recommendations for further study include studies of community attitudes toward such an educational plan, and additional studies of educator attitudes.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Purpose of the Study

One of the popular notions used to explain the growing alienation
of youth in our society is the lack of communication between youth and
adults, the so-called "generation gap." One very promising solution to
this problem is that offered by the Parkway Program of the Philadelphia
school system, a program which maximizes communication between high
school students and adults. The purpose of this dissertation is to
delineate this communication problem, describe the Parkway Program, and
poll certain Language Arts educators in Florida as to the practicability
and feasibility of utilizing such a program in the English curriculum.

Statement of the Problem

In her 1963 study of the public school in America, Grace Graham
indicates that the alienation of youth had its beginnings during the era
when child labor laws were passed and the country became heavily
industrialized and urbanized. As industrialization progressed, young
people began losing responsibilities they once had for helping to operate
the home. Eventually they found they had no significant work to do and
were being kept in a state of protracted childhood. Today the young
person who finds himself

>   . . . excluded from adult social, political and civic activities
> and intellectual life, bands together with his age mates in
> self-defense. He becomes excessively dependent upon his friends,
> who occupy the same anomalous situation in the social

order. Like them, he faces many choices among conflicting standards and competing interests in a complex milieu. Small wonder that juvenile delinquency is increasing, for at the very time in life when a person is most vigorous, idealistic, enthusiastic, and impressionable, he is shunted from the mainstreams of life and limited in his contacts with mature persons in his community. He wants and needs activities that seem to him to be significant and important—jobs into which he can put his heart and mind and muscles" (30).

Although inclined to agree with Miss Graham's assessment of the problems of modern American youth, one wonders if she would make the following statement were she writing the book today: "Not all teenagers are in revolt against adult values. Most of them, in fact, reflect rather than resist the influences of their parents. Their parents want popularity, material possessions, and fun, too. Quarrels between teenagers and their families are about their status as children or young adults, about their privileges, not their values" (23).

A point of view often heard today, with regard to youthful values, is that expressed by Joseph Maloney at the 1969 convention of the American Public Health Association. According to Mr. Maloney, today's young people dwell on problems of social injustice because technology has largely eliminated the problems to which mankind has traditionally been heir. In his opinion, "the way to communicate with the young is to stay young and alive, to be loving, and to be willing to let the young share in a more vigorous leadership and drive towards achieving humane and mutually respectful human relations and more effective social justice" (41). That such involvement is being strenuously sought by numerous student groups is obvious to anyone who reads the newspaper. Some want to be "let in" on the action; others want to take charge themselves. One group seeking the right to participate is the City General Organization Council of New York City, a student organization which claims to represent the quarter million secondary students in that

city. Its goal is to secure the creation of a "liaison board" of ten students, five parents, four teachers and a principal for each of New York's ninety high schools, so that, according to their seventeen year old leader, ". . . drastic revisions of the curriculum, social attitudes and administrative behavior [can be made]. 'If there is not," he warns, "within the next five or seven years the schools will blow up racially, blow up with drugs and blow up politically" (35).

Sympathetic with this point of view are two writers who call for an end to excessive institutionalism in the schools: "Rigidly organized schools with often irrelevant curricula are being resisted by students who are tired of being treated like mindless, immature, automatons. Total institutionalization may be okay for animals or young children, but no one else" (18).

Another writer puts it this way: "The practice of encouraging, through a new structure, the idea that personal fulfillment is the first responsibility of an educational system, and that human dignity is not founded on a single standard, may do more than anything else to mitigate the alienation and hostility of the angry young" (55).

Not only is there a serious problem with relations between the older and younger generations, and between students and their schools, but there is also a serious deficiency in school-community relations in all but a very few communities. People are either indifferent to what goes on or are only concerned that order be kept. In the last few years there have been renewed efforts to mend this breach by hiring public relations specialists for school districts or community relations directors for individual schools. Leo B. Wicks tells of an experiment which used "indigenous" personnel in slum neighborhoods to act as "liaison" agents between the schools and the parents. The evaluation of the project showed

that, while these agents helped establish a good working relationship between the schools and local communities, they could not change the negative attitudes held by the parents (34). In his recently published book about the Philadelphia school system, Henry Resnick reports that some parent groups in slum neighborhoods have become sufficiently militant in their efforts to reform the schools that they have intimidated principals and the central administration, and in one case, perpetuated a kind of extortion (53).

In the suburbs there is more interaction between the communities and schools because of the middle-class nature of these communities. Middle-class people value education as the primary means of securing socioeconomic advancement for their children. Unfortunately, however, the cordial, reciprocal relationship between the school and community that one would expect is often not present, because of the attitude many of them possess that education is a means, an instrument for securing personal goals. Nat Hentoff quotes a British anthropologist as saying that most of us use education as a "weapon of war" to achieve those things we want for ourselves. We use it to "back down the competition." Hentoff believes that "if the message from home is that education is the way to get ahead, and only that, it will take an extraordinary concatenation . . . to eradicate that infection, the infection of competition for the sake of Number One, and to hell with the rest" (33). Grace Graham explains this phenomenon as partly a reaction by these suburbanites to their earlier experiences with big city school systems, when "they had little opportunity to influence the bureaucracy of the . . . system" (26).

Other writers who have voiced concern over school-community conflict are: Grinnel and Young, who make an appeal for the creation

of a "living" curriculum, one which involves intimate contact with the social and physical environment of the school (21); Martin Essex, who feels that the school and community should relate to each other through "cooperative" rather than "adversary" actions (14); Harold Howe, former United States Commissioner of Education, who believes that "the future health of our public schools" is more dependent on constructive citizen participation than any other factor (36); and, Ronald B. Jackson, who warns us that "the lesson is clear and the time to act is now. Schools which function without reference to where they are and what's happening around them are doomed to pretense and irrelevance" (37). In a speech given at the ASCD convention in March, 1970, Samuel D. Proctor all but issued a mandate for community-oriented education:

> It is a tough assignment to ask education to undertake the task of building a genuine sense of community in America. It is a task that needs urgent attention, but is education ready or able?
>
> . . . .
>
> It is only natural that education take the lead in this difficult task since we have spent millions of dollars developing an educational system that takes the student from age five to twenty without significant cost to his parents.
> We want education to prepare us to live in a society of variety and make it work, to live among people with widely differing starting points and find joy in seeing them all moving forward at their optimum pace, to find happiness and fulfillment not in power--in domination-- in self-destructive greed and materialism--but in helping others to find value in their lives. We want education to define a new goal for us that is more satisfying than affluence, more humane than race and class strife, and more decent than self-indulgence.
>
> . . . .
>
> We are told how much our freedom is circumscribed-- by such thinkers as Darwin, Marx and Freud, but what we need to know now is how much freedom is left, and the answer to this question is the new frontiers of education and the prerequisite for genuine community. Can we transcend these biological, cultural and evolutionary influences?
>
> . . . .

The task before us is to convert our mastery over
things external to a mastery over our impulses, our
prejudices, our loyalties, and our commitments that
come from within. Our vision in the field of education
must reach far beyond the development of skills in the
cognitive areas, the organization and communication of
facts and ideas. We need insight into those affective
areas of learning where values are formed, where a
definition of the person is evolved, and where working
hypotheses about the human family are constantly under
scrutiny.

. . . .

It is in this area of endeavor that we consider
the most serious question of all, how to prepare the
young to accept the notion of genuine community and
the challenge to spend a lifetime in its pursuit (51).

The Plan of the Study

The Parkway Program was used as a model in this study because it
seems to offer viable solutions to the alienation problem by stressing
the student's development as an individual and as a member of the complex,
multifaceted American society. It does this by providing as many and
varied learning opportunities as possible and by utilizing the abundant
community resources which are available in Phildelphia, especially along
the Franklin Parkway. Many of the various business, industrial, technical
and cultural establishments have made personnel available to the school
as "institutional" instructors. Students signing up for the pharmacy
course, for example, meet in the board room of Smith, Kline and French
pharmaceutical company, where they may, for example, study a basic course
in pharmacy and debate the problem of drug abuse in our society. In
conjunction with these "institutional" courses, each student belongs to
a small "tutorial group" (fifteen students, one teacher, and one student
teacher), where he receives, among other services, classroom instruction
in the basic areas that are required by state law. Inasmuch as the
school has been given great latitude in the way in which it satisfies

these requirements, the student has many options here also. Communication skills, for example, can be satisfied by taking the required number of any of forty classroom "course" offerings, plus a variety of experiences in the community, such as studying at newspaper offices, magazine offices, television studios, etc.[1] There are even offerings in non-verbal communication as well, such as some kinds of photography.

Specifically, the plan of this study was to ascertain, from a random sampling of public and private senior high school English teachers in selected Florida counties, all supervisors of English in these counties, and English Education professors in the state at large, whether or not the Parkway approach to teaching English is educationally valid, and if so which educational practices (independent study, flexible scheduling, individualized instruction, etc.) are necessary to this validity, and whether the program would be acceptable in their respective schools and communities. Because the city of Philadelphia is so large, and has so many cultural assets, this research was restricted to those counties which are designated as "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas", counties which have at least one city of 50,000 or more, and meet other criterial urban characteristics.[2]

---

[1] This information about the nature of the required coursework and communication program was supplied in a telephone conversation with Miss Strick, the "public information officer" and an English teacher at the Parkway School.

[2] The determination of "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas" for Florida was made by consulting Bureau of the Census reports for 1967 and 1970.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

In a telephone conversation with the "public information officer"
at the Parkway school, this writer learned that there have been no
research studies made of the Program yet, but that studies are planned,
as soon as appropriate evaluation instruments can be made. Because of
the nature of the school, the Program directors feel that present instru-
ments do not accurately assess the academic achievement of the students.
Thus, in the absence of any research data, the reading for this study
has been restricted to descriptions of the Program, and to books and
articles dealing with associated or constituent concepts, such as those
which discuss the drawbacks of conventional structured or "walled"
schools; alienation of students, parents, community, teachers, etc.;
volunteer workers in education, paraprofessionals, parent aides, etc.;
school-community relations; independent study, flexible scheduling,
etc. In conjunction with this an evaluation was made of any Language
Arts--English Education articles which seemed to be associated with the
concepts under consideration, such as English independent study programs,
individualized Language Arts programs, the future of high school English,
innovation and change in English, basic issues in the teaching of
English, etc.

All these issues are discussed for the purpose of giving the reader
a background and context in which to view the central issue under
consideration in this study: the practicability and feasibility of

community oriented education. It is hoped that the few representative
selections on each topic discussed in this chapter will provide the
reader with some knowledge of "the state of the art" with respect to
the topics, and that this information, together with that provided in
chapter one, will give him some insight into not only the educational
but also the social, economic, historical, political, and maybe even
religious factors which would influence any judgement on the desirability
of community oriented education.

The literature in general reveals that many different groups are
becoming increasingly dissatisfied with high school programs as they
are currently being conducted--especially in the inner cities. The
appeals being made are for changes in curriculum, school organization
and administration, level of parent and community involvement with the
school, level of school involvement with the community, etc. For the
most part, school-community relations is polite but distant, but a move-
ment is underway to bring the two closer together, as attested by the
burgeoning growth of various "alternative" schools and the growing
number of energetic, sometimes militant parent groups.

English Instruction

The Language Arts, English Education literature reveals that the
profession at large is greatly interested in changing and broadening
the English program in order to accommodate a wider range of student
abilities and satisfy a wider spectrum of student needs. One writer
calls for more "effective contact" between teachers and pupils, better
articulation with other grades, elimination of remedial English courses
and, for the college student who wants to become an English teacher,
extensive training in the mass media (13). Robert Oliphant calls

for a one-to-one relationship between the English teacher and student, something like that between a doctoral student and his director. In this way the student's "felt need" and the teacher's knowledge of "advanced research" would merge at an educational "locus point." Unfortunately, however, he continues, "these possibilities. . . are somewhat circumscribed by the structure of educational institutions; our present framework of courses and credits may not permit the kind of interaction I have exemplified" (47).

Another writer advocates a "student-centered Language Arts" program which emphasizes a "naturalistic" approach to language study, a learning process in which the student is actively rather than passively involved (58). The same advice is given in a report on the Anglo-American Seminar on English teaching. Here the suggestion is that English be a "shaper of experience," which is learned through experience using it. The influence such a curriculum is likely to have on school-community relations is also discussed (11). In "Planning for Change in English Education" Bhola says that English teachers should provide leadership and guidance in bringing Education up to date. Four major issues with which they should be immediately concerned are: 1) the individual versus the group, 2) local versus state control, 3) the common versus the elite, and 4) the right to privacy versus public obligation (3).

In his 1969 article, "English Progress and Transition," Dwight Burton tells us that the assessment of the work of curriculum study centers and the insights of the Dartmouth Seminar on the status of English instruction point to six major directions in the teaching of English. Four of the six have strong implications for the future of community-oriented English instruction:

i) increased relevance and vitality in literature study through attention to student response to literature and the elimination of censorship and moral bias. . . 4) ascendance of oral language, dramatic activities, and an overall dramatic approach to education, 5) the study and use of non-print media as both art and communication forms to achieve traditional objectives and to involve students in creating such non-print forms as films, and 6) revision of methods and materials for dealing with culturally disadvantaged students, with a renewed emphasis on a teacher-student rapport and trust (5).

A dissertation study which compared British and American English curricula is revealing of insights which, in this writer's opinion, contribute substantially to our understanding of the basic problem with English teaching in America:

In the American approach, the emphasis is placed on the development of a discipline model of English which identifies the underlying structure of the discipline and utilizes it in constructing cumulative, sequential curricula. The emphasis in the English approach is directed toward the development of a process model which focuses on the child rather than on the subject . . . . The American discipline model stresses the intellectual mastery of content; ignores the affective dimensions of reading, talking, and writing; measures abstract thinking, and impersonal, logical writing; and is uncompromisingly cognitive. The British process model attempts to unify English; stresses personal writing and the habit of active, imaginative response to literature; and is activity oriented (48).

A few years ago the National Council of Teachers of English sponsored a study of the most "outstanding" English programs in the nation. The findings of this four year study were published under the title, High School English Instruction Today (New York, 1968). Based on their observations of these English programs, the "project observers" make a number of recommendations to the English teaching profession. Among those that relate to the question of community oriented English are the following:

1) The school principal and English department chairman should be

responsible for "fostering within the school and the community a realistic tradition of learning adjusted to the needs and expectations of the students. . ." (p. 246).

2) The best English programs include "a commendable variety and abundance of materials used in the classroom, including class sets of books, classroom book collections, and audiovisual materials, as well as large and accessible library facilities" (p. 246).

3) More provision must be made for the less talented students. Interesting and imaginative instruction is possible for them also (pp. 246-247).

4) If more of his tasks could be assigned to "clerks and semi-professional aides," the teacher would have more time to attend to professional duties (p. 249).

5) Because of their inaccessibility and lack of adequate facilities and materials, many school libraries are used less by many students than are the public libraries. In order to make the school facilities more useful to students, major changes in the physical plant and in scheduling will have to be made (p. 260).

6) Because of poor teaching-learning conditions in many metropolitan high schools, experienced teachers avoid them. This has made many city schools a "testing ground" for new teachers, a situation which must be rectified (p. 261).

7) "Specialized classrooms with extensive teaching aids and learning materials selected for their relevance to the needs of English classes at particular levels, along with a well-equipped department center, are among the most promising of

the many attempts to make teaching in outdated facilities more bearable and indeed are approaches which might well be considered with advantage by any school, whether overcrowded or not" (p. 261).

8) In large cities, district-wide book adoption policies "to avoid censorship controversies" curtail teacher initiative. Measures should be taken to allow such teachers greater latitude in meeting the individual needs of their students (p. 262).

9) "Experimental English programs must be careful to sacrifice neither continuity and integrity of subject matter nor student-teacher relationships. Intricate attempts to restructure classes, change content, or respond to student interests too often neglect any overview of the problems and sequence of English instruction" (p. 263).

10) "Several innovations seem of special merit, among them the provision of special English study halls, organized reading rooms, or English laboratories; the individualization of instruction through seminar classes; and the introduction of humanities courses. The specialized facilities for English are the one successful alternative which some schools have found to problems of limited facilities and inaccessible collections" (pp. 263-264).

Flexible Scheduling

The findings of a recent national seminar on modular, flexible scheduling lend strong support to the concept of community-oriented education. A report on the seminar tells us that schools utilizing this system are having difficulty providing facilities for large numbers

of students with unscheduled time, but "assuming that reasonable progress

has been made in correcting certain problem areas," education in the

1980's will be much more community oriented than it is today:

> 4) Decision making regarding instruction will be
> decentralized, to a large extent, to the teaching-learning
> level. The basic organizational unit of the school will
> not be the class. Rather it will be the teaching-learning
> team with from three to twelve members. Community consult-
> ants as well as teachers will be members of these teams.
>   5) The teaching-learning team will use the community
> as a learning laboratory. Businesses, industries, and
> governmental agencies will appoint "education officers" to
> work with the teaching-learning teams. In some cases they
> will set aside space for learning and, with professional
> help, will develop specific units of instruction. Any one
> student will belong to several such teams. He may, for
> example, belong to a learning team of three students
> studying, with the help of a businessman, the problem of
> growing government restrictions on small business. He may
> also belong to a science-math team working in a local
> industrial plant on practical applications of principles
> studied in the school lab.
>   11) Policy making will be more decentralized in the
> 1980's than it is now. . . . Community members will be
> involved in policy making activities at all levels--
> district, individual school, and teaching-learning team. .
> . .
>   13) Some specific practices which may prove success-
> ful and thus become common practice by 1980 are: Courses
> of study of short duration (sometimes called 'minicourses'),
> initiated by students, teachers, or community consultants
> (20).

Among the "next steps" the writer suggests for moving toward the

flexibly scheduled school is the following: "Design a mobile

classroom (perhaps a modified micro-bus) which teaching-learning

teams can use anywhere in the community."

Individualized Instruction

A recent progress report on individually prescribed instruction
(IPI) contains a three-part breakdown which defines IPI, recounts its
history, tells where the programs are located, and provides a bibliog-
raphy at the end. Some of the findings which have implications for
community-oriented education are the following: "IPI does indeed provide
for individualization for the learner by removing the ceiling for the
learner. Scores and rate of progress for IPI pupils are statistically
greater than for those for the non-IPI pupils. . . . . Based on inter-
view data, IPI pupils like school better than non-IPI pupils. One
ghetto school using IPI has reduced its 'police contacts' from an
average of 137 a year to one per year. . ." (52).

For an informative discussion of individualizing practices in
English during the 1970-1971 school year, including a discussion of
Parkway English, the reader is referred to Humanizing English: Do Not
Fold, Spindle or Mutilate. Classroom Practices in Teaching English
1970-1971 (15).

Independent Study

The literature published in the last three years on English
independent study is sparse. That which is available seems to be
contradictory. One article describes a highly selective, academically
oriented independent study program which has proven quite successful.
An evaluation of the program indicates that although high grade point
average is not a decisive criterion, the above average or superior
students do best with independent study. The writer goes on to say
that evaluations of the method show that the independent study student
is better read and informed (perhaps because he is academically superior

to begin with); he learns to be responsible for himself and thus has less trouble with college classes; and follow-up studies show that his performance in college is well above the average (16).

Another article describes an "electives" English independent study program which stands in contrast to the one above. This program is open to any student who can get a faculty member to sponsor his proposed project. The single criterion for accepting an independent study project is that it must culminate "with the student's communicating successfully in some form with at least one other individual." The results for the Regent's Exam showed no significant difference between regular eleventh grade students and those in the electives program (45). Alexander and Hines' 1966 survey of independent study practices in the secondary school contains not only some revealing information on the method in general, but also on English in particular, such as their findings of more independent study programs in English than in any other subject, and the fact that 78% of the English teachers in schools using independent study favored "expanding" rather than "curtailing" the program (1).

Regarding the strengths and weaknesses of independent study in general, Murray Melnick offers a review of the research literature:

> Independent Study (IND) programs are increasingly favored as part of the generally favorable attitude toward student autonomy. On the basis of experimental evidence, the unhesitating acceptance of IND does not appear to be completely justified. Some research studies found IND to be superior to traditional methods in terms of learning efficiency; others found IND inferior on these terms. Others concluded there was no difference. The implications of the research are thus inconclusive. In order to get more meaningful results from research studies, more complex questions must be asked, such as "In what ways is IND superior, for what kinds of students, with what kinds of training, studying what subjects, with what degree of faculty interaction?" (42).

Educational Media

Among the many sophisticated materials and devices currently being used to facilitate learning, the computer is perhaps the most influential because of the tremendous capability and versatility of computer technology. According to Lawrence M. Stolurow, "the transition from the little red school house to the computer-based school system is one of the more dramatic and significant developments taking place in the shadow of the space race and in the climate of the cold war" (57). Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) is currently being utilized on two levels of interaction with the student: drill and practice, in which a heirarchy of problems with respect to their levels of difficulty is constructed and programmed into the computer; and the more sophisticated tutorial systems, which are capable of accommodating the individual student's personal needs and interests (64). Professor Pat Suppes of Stanford University enthusiastically endorses CAI as a means for providing to students at all ability levels "the kind of individualized instruction once possible only for a few members of the aristocracy. . ." (64).

Among the advantages of CAI as expressed by students of the medium are: 1) The ability of the computer to store detailed and comprehensive data on every student (32), 2) Its ability to provide individualized instruction (64), and 3) Its ability, as an impersonal machine, to draw out the inhibited student who is reluctant to "open up" to another person (17). Among the disadvantages are: 1) The extreme expense of computer equipment or time, 2) The unavailability of sufficient CAI programs, because of the extreme complexities involved in making them, and 3) The rather slow response time of current computers, because of the large number of students using them and the complexity of the programs (31).

All of the above problems are being worked on and solutions are expected in the near future. The criticism that computers are impersonal and dehumanizing is answered by pointing out that CAI should give the teacher more time for personal interaction with each of his students. A second, political criticism of CAI is that it contributes to federal standardization of education. This is answered by pointing out that the tutorial program emphasizes the individualization of instruction; i.e., it is designed to respond to the learner's expressed needs and interests. For those "drill and practice" programs which would tend to be standardized, the danger of federal control is not nearly so important as the opportunity it provides to eliminate educational inequities among the various regions of our country (31).

Guidance and Counselling

Another feature of modern education which may be necessary to the success of a Parkway-type school program is special guidance services. In the Parkway Program this service is rendered in the "Tutorial," a group of fifteen students, a teacher, and a teacher aide. This group is responsible not only for the learner's instruction in the required subject areas but also for his personal counselling needs. It provides him with a family-like intimacy and security he may not be getting at home. The two faculty members in the Tutorial make it their responsibility to involve the parents and guardians of their pupils as much as possible and spend a good deal of their time interacting with these adults (49). In the most recent Parkway Program brochure the guidance functions of the Tutorial are described in terms of the group's several characteristics: ". . . the Tutorial is. . .a guidance unit, in that the Tutorial leader is responsible for helping students to choose courses

of study intelligently and for seeing that the student is enrolled in courses which will help him meet his goals; . . . It is a human relations, or support unit, for while a student may be engaged in a constantly changing course of study according to his own interests, the Tutorial remains a constant in the sea of variables--a place where he is expected to learn to work effectively with a group which he did not choose, a group which is likely to contain many people very different from him in background. Learning to function under these conditions is not easy, but it is perhaps the most important thing a student should learn" (49).

The importance of special counselling services in schools with loose organizational structures like Parkway has been pointed out repeatedly in the literature on such schools. For example, "in the five years of modular-flexible scheduling" at John Marshall High School in Portland, Oregon, the role of counsellor "has become one of greater importance. . . . Theirs is the awesome responsibility of helping the student realize his full potential in his course of study, choice of college or work, and even his every day behavior as he tries to under-stand success or failure. One could say that this is so regardless of the kind of program the child has--and this is true. But only in a program similar to Marshall's is the child on independent time from 20% to 50% of his school week and thereby free to choose how he will use his time" (7). In Kimball Wiles' high school of the future, it is the "analysis group" which would provide the special counselling services. This group of ten pupils and a "skilled teacher-counsellor" would discuss "any problem of ethics, social concern, out-of-school experience or implication of knowledge encountered in [other classes]" (67). In "Looking Ahead in Secondary Education," J. Lloyd Trump tells

us that "guidance services and attention to students as individuals
will be increased as the secondary school places less emphasis upon
mass classroom recitation. . . . Emphasis will be given to developing
students who are capable of solving their own problems" (65).

Citizen Participation

One of the main issues confronting educators today, an issue of
central importance to the success of any Parkway-type program, is that
of citizen participation. It is not a matter of whether or not there
should be participation, but rather what kind and how much. Only the
most hidebound Essentialist or Neo-Scholasticist would dare suggest that
such participation be minimal. Just about every teacher and administrator
subscribes to the idea in principle, but very few make any earnest effort
to secure such involvement, most probably because of the additional
administrative burden it causes. In recent years, however, the crush
of schooling problems has caused the more conscientious administrators
to seek assistance from their communities; others have had such assistance
forced upon them.

Simply stated, the problem with school-community relations today is
one of relevancy. What takes place in schools is often viewed as having
very little to do with what takes place in the real world outside of it.
Advanced civilizations create formal schooling as a means of simplifying
the complex culture which must be transmitted to the young, but the more
complex the culture becomes the more likely it is that the school will
not accurately reflect conditions as they actually exist in the culture.
Such a disparity cannot long be tolerated if the school is to function
as a meaningful, viable force in the society. Grace Graham quotes John
Dewey as saying· "Not only the pupils' interests but also the current

problems of a changing society should determine the curriculum of schools. . . . Education has to close the gap between the classroom and life in family, community, and business world. The job of the teacher is to provide desirable experiences out of which. . .all genuine education comes. These experiences are the results of the teacher's planning of subject matter, methods of instruction, and social relationships" (22).

In discussing participation as a means of eliminating school-community conflict, Graham suggests that those schools which encourage widespread participation are in a better position "to resist divisive and irrational conflict" (25). She believes that expanding the number of participants in school affairs is important in a democratic society, but that training is necessary if such involvement is to be effective. The implication for education is that children--especially those from the lower classes--must be given the chance to learn participatory skills, so that as adults they will possess the necessary attitudes and skills to participate effectively (28). Manifesting a more scientific bent, Morphet, Johns and Reller use Homans' hypotheses on the "human group" in deriving some generalizations on the nature of citizen participation: "1) The more all people--faculty, students, and parents--interact with each other, the more opportunity they have to like each other. 2) Sentiments of liking grow up between teachers and administrators who work on the job together, and these sentiments will lead to other activity beyond the requirements of the job. 3) If the communications between a faculty group and a community group are reduced and this lessening of communications is accompanied by an increase in the negative sentiments of each group toward the other, then the members of each group are drawn closer together, but intergroup hostility is increased" (43).

That educators increasingly will have to be concerned with the conflict issue is asserted in a recent article by Luvern L. Cunningham, who says that "prospects for early definitions and early solutions of our institutional problems are not promising." We must find ways, he continues, of dealing with the complexities and uncertainties which baffle and frustrate the profession. As part of our responsibility, "we must search for forms of participation" which will make for responsible, effective contributions from the student and adult citizen, as well as from the professional community (10).

A specific way in which the school and community join forces is reported in a book entitled Do Citizens and Education Mix? This report on a governor's fact-finding commission on education details the issue involved in a controversy among the members of the School Study Council of Brookhaven, Connecticut. One major faction argued against higher taxes for schools because such taxes would serve to deter new industry from coming to the community. The opposing faction, referring to reports by other study groups in the state, suggested that the long view take priority, that industry will not want to move to a locality where the citizenry does not possess modern work skills and a conducive attitude toward industrialization. Thus, support for increased school expenditures and expansion of the curriculum was wrought through active participation by the citizenry on a specific issue. The school administrators simply presented the problem, along with pertinent technical information, and let the community (through its study group) come up with a solution (12).

Sumption and Engstrom suggest that the school has a responsibility to its community which is comparable to that a corporation has to its stockholders (62). If the school expects the community to support bond issues, serve as an educational laboratory, etc., then the school must

communicate what it is doing and why. Parsons and Cave maintain that a
program of deliberate communication and cooperation between schools and
their patrons can help restore that educative influence which was once
exerted naturally by the home and the community, but which was largely
lost through the process of urbanization (50). M. Scott Norton recom-
mends that school-community interaction be facilitated through preservice
and inservice training in public relations for educators and by making
the school an "open system" (46).

A Stanford University research project on school-community relations,
one which seems to offer more in defining the problem than in offering
solutions, concludes that better school-community relations depends on
better mutual understanding. This can be effected, it continues, through
effective mediating agencies between the two entities. School and
community leaders, through better understanding of the relationship, can
function in a positive manner rather than the negative way it operates
now (expediency, political maneuvering to settle or avoid crises). With-
out such a reciprocal understanding and cooperation, citizens will continue
to be just "consumers" of education, each caring only what happens to his
own children, rather than being "partners in the enterprise" (6). Other
specific suggestions on how to promote school-community cooperation are
offered in an article about a training manual for school-board members
(68), and another dealing with a training program for school administra-
tors (69). For discussions of school-community policies and programs
in specific communities, see "One School Board's Response to Community
Demands" (9) and "Citizen Participation in School Affairs in Two
Southern Cities" (54).

One dimension of school-community relations which is becoming
increasingly important, and thus one to which neglectful administrators

soon must heed, is that of coordination with other social agencies. While cooperation of the sort just discussed is of course important, cooperation between the school and various official social agencies is also important in attempting to develop a comprehensive public relations program. The county health department, the city welfare office, the state employment office, youth agencies, the city parks commission--these kinds of organizations can be of great assistance to the school if properly organized and coordinated. As one group of writers put it, the need for such cooperative effort is made more acute by "the growing concentration of population in metropolitan areas and the growing complexity of society. . . . This appears necessary and inevitable if education and the other services are to be administered effectively. Closer coordination among the services should lead to better understanding of children by the various agencies and. . . result in the strengthening of each agency, because greater understanding would result between and among the lay and professional personnel. . ." (44).

As for the citizens advisory committee, the literature indicates that there are many and varied kinds of such organizations. These vary from the traditional, prestigious school committees, which exert a conservative influence on school policy, to the currently popular Parent-Teacher-Student Associations, which have moved away from such innocuous projects as securing band uniforms and have taken up such controversial issues as drug abuse and sexual freedom (38). It would appear that the venerable PTA has at last responded to such recommendations as those made by Graham in 1963: "The local PTA might be more effective if it studied important youth problems, such as delinquency and recreational activities, and if it provided opportunities for young people, teachers, and parents to do

something about these problems" (27). Sumption and Engstrom strongly
advocate the use of citizen advisory groups, and discuss the issue at
length. One of their recommendations for increasing the effectiveness
of such groups is to determine the "level of participation" for each
citizen in the group (61). The particular level to which a person
is assigned would presumably depend on his experience and educational
background. The duties of level one involve collecting and assembling
information; level two involves classifying and interpreting data; and
level three personnel are responsible for making judgements and
recommendations. As for who joins advisory committees and interacts
with the school in other ways, it comes as no surprise to learn that
"many researchers have found a recurring theme in studies of participa-
tion. The extent of participation in formal organizations increases as
income and educational level increases" (24). Thus, so far as the
issue of school-community relations is concerned, the primary problem
for educators is how to involve citizens in the lower socioeconomic
classes in school affairs in such a way as to make them feel like they
belong, that the school is as much theirs as anyone else's.

One deterrent to widespread citizen participation with which
educators must deal is that of the excessive influence exerted by the
community power structure and by vocal special interest groups. As
Graham points out, farmers seem to exert a disproportionate amount
of influence in rural areas (29), and the same could be said of business-
men in the cities. Such groups as the Daughters of the American
Revolution, the American Legion, local religious organizations, and
labor unions (including the AFT) also exert more influence on the
schools than should be their right in a democratic society. To counter
such influence, Sumption and Engstrom recommend that the school

administrator do all he can to identify the community power structure, a job which may prove to be something like "solving a crossword puzzle." Coupled with this effort should be "free disclosure and wide publicity" of school policies and programs, so as to let as many people as possible know what is going on. This communication should be carried out through the medium of a carefully developed communication structure, one that would include a carefully selected citizen advisory group (59). Some of the communication channels which are available to most schools are radio and television stations, many of which allow students and staff free time for broadcasting school news; and local publications, such as neighborhood weeklies, church bulletins, shopping guides, and corporation magazines of various kinds (61).

Reviewing the issue of decentralization, Carol Lopate and others report that studies show that greater community involvement in school affairs "enhances children's development and academic achievement." It gives parents a sense of power, of having some control over what takes place in the school. The child, also feeling a sense of power over his education, experiences growth in motivation, aspirations, and attitudes (40). Usdan reports that the issue of decentralization has caused conflict between parent groups and teacher groups, because the latter feel that such fragmentation of administrative authority mitigates their negotiating power with the central administration (66). A. Donald Bourgeois is one of many educators who maintain that decentralization is not enough to correct the inequities of urban education. What he and his compatriots call for is community control of its educational institutions. Under this arrangement, "the 'advisory' shoe is on the other foot--the community hires professional consultants to provide technical assistance where needed. The initiative for defining problems

and designing programs is entirely with the citizens, and it has been
observed that such programs produce significantly more for the money"
(4). Another approach to community control of education is through
the establishment of "alternative" schools apart from the official
educational structure. Such schools are springing up all over the
country at a surprising rate, and show promise of becoming a matter
with which the "official" school administrator must soon reckon. For
interesting and informative discussions of the "alternative" school,
the reader is referred to Jonathon Kozol, "In Roxbury, Way Out of a
Fortress" (39), and John Fischer, "Who Needs Schools?" (19).
Finally, for a stimulating discussion of decentralization and community
control as inadequate attempts to deal with inequalities that are
fundamentally socio-economic-political in nature--and must be dealt
with on this level--see David K. Cohen, "The Price of Community Control"
(8).

Teacher Assistants

A kind of community participation that is essential to realizing
the full potential of community oriented education is that of volunteer
workers and paid paraprofessionals and aides. In a recent publication
by the United States Office of Education, a number of suggestions are
given on how to use Title I (ESEA) money to enrich the educational
experiences of culturally deprived children. Three of the five
suggestions have to do with the use of paid and unpaid teacher assist-
ants; such as home visiting aides, lay readers, volunteers for reading
and conversational English programs, teenage volunteers for libraries,
senior citizen volunteers, sixth graders tutoring first graders, tutors
who teach their hobbies, and various and sundry people who might want

simply to interact with school children (56).

In his latest book, Crisis in the Classroom, Charles Silberman makes an interesting case for widespread use of teacher assistants. He maintains that since practically everyone in the community educates whether he knows it or not, then persons in all occupations should begin thinking of themselves as educators: "To suggest that journalists, editors, television writers, directors, and producers, filmmakers, and publishers are educators does not really stretch the conventional definition of education very far. Nor would people have any difficulty regarding museum directors, librarians, or ministers, priests, and rabbis as educators. If we are to create a new American paideia, however, the definition of education will have to be broadened to include a great many occupations not generally thought of under that rubric" (p. 42).

One kind of "teacher assistant" which is gaining increased recognition is the student himself. Many teachers are discovering that when one student tutors another, the tutor is sometimes benefitted more by the interaction than is the tutee, by virtue of the tutor having to learn the subject matter better in order to teach it. The benefits are not only cognitive, however, there is also a positive influence on the tutor's self concept to know that he is able to help someone. In 1968 the National Commission on Resources for Youth, Inc, published a document entitled "Supervisors Manual: Youth Tutoring Youth," which is described as "an after school (or summer) tutorial program in which fourteen or fifteen year old In-School, Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees earn money by helping younger children enjoy reading, writing and other skills of expression" (63).

Community Resources

The idea of making use of community resources is not a new one in education. Such resources constituted the curriculum before schools were invented and are still being used in pre-literate societies today. In the 1930's there was a revival of interest in the practice as schools joined their communities in coping with the hardships of the Depression. Such works as Paul Hanna's Youth Serves the Community (1936) or Elsie Clapp's Community Schools in Action (1939) give us an account of community oriented education during this era. In recent years the need for closer school-community cooperation has again manifested itself, giving rise to such publications as "The City as School" (1969), "Creative Teaching Using the Sun-Times in the English Curriculum" (1970), "Computerized Community Resources Handbook:. . ." (1970), and "Tapping the Community" (1971).

In a speech before the NASSP convention in January, 1971, Stephen K. Bailey argued convincingly for making the city the classroom (2). "All too many of our urban and suburban schools," he contended, "are tradition-bound, custodial, crisis-ridden, and cynical." Life for students in such schools is barren and gray. Education should be an "adventure", and the only way to make it this way is to put students in contact with the vitality of real life by exposing them "directly to the chartless frontiers of urban pathology and to the wondrous options of urban creativity and life styles" (p. 167).

Although they end on a rather romantic note, Bailey's concluding remarks make an eloquent apology for community oriented education:

> When you return to your respective homes and offices and find the same crunch, the same in-basket, the same crisis, the same weariness, take a moment, look out the window at your surrounding city and say out loud, "I was once told that only professionals like me could and should run schools. It isn't true now, if it ever was."

And then, mentally, I want you to see yourself standing in a circle--an open circle--formed by the linkage of hands of supervisors, teachers, paraprofessionals, students, maintenance men, artists, police, bus drivers, parents, older brothers and sisters, TV managers, in short, all your civic neighbors--and you are saying to them very simply, but earnestly, "We need each other" (pp. 171-172).

CHAPTER III

REPORT OF THE SURVEY

Counties Chosen for the Survey

Because the Parkway Program is located in Philadelphia, a large city
rich in cultural assets, it was decided that the survey of opinion on the
use of community resources should be restricted to those school systems
in Florida counties with cities of 50,000 population or more. The 1967
Bureau of the Census report indicates that there are eight standard metro-
politan statistical areas in Florida. These areas include Broward, Dade,
Duval, Escambia-Santa Rosa, Hillsborough-Pinellas, Leon, Orange-Seminole,
and Palm Beach Counties. A ninth area, Alachua County, will be included
in the 1970 Census data, according to the Gainesville, Florida, Regional
Planning Council. Although not a standard metropolitan statistical area,
Brevard County was included in the study because of its abundant cultural
resources at Cape Kennedy. The populations of the counties and "central
cities" of these standard metropolitan statistical areas, and that of
Brevard County and its central cities, are given in Table 1.

Persons Chosen for the Survey

Having consulted the 1970-1971 Florida Educational Directory and identi-
fied the appropriate supervisor or administrator in each of the thirteen
target counties, the person conducting the survey sent a letter to each
county asking for the names of all senior high school (grades 9-12, 10-12)
English teachers in that county. The response was poor; only eight of the

-31-

TABLE 1

Populations of Counties and "Central Cities" of the
Nine Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in Florida .

County	County Population	City	City Population
Alachua	103,877	Gainesville	63,818
Brevard	224,672	Melbourne	39,885
"	"	Titusville	29,605
"	"	Cocoa	15,556
Broward	612,006	Ft. Lauderdale	139,122
"	"	Hollywood	104,018
Dade	1,259,126	Miami	331,553
Duval	513,439	Jacksonville	513,439
Escambia	201,030	Pensacola	65,442
Hillsborough	484,490	Tampa	274,359
Leon	102,530	Tallahassee	71,763
Orange	344,094	Orlando	97,565
Palm Beach	345,553	W. Palm Beach	56,865
Pinellas	515,123	St. Petersburg	213,189
Santa Rosa	36,965	(Pensacola)	
Seminole	82,656	(Orlando)	

thirteen responded and only five of these sent the list of names as requested. Of the three refusal letters, one explained that permission would have to be obtained from the superintendent's office, one said that permission from the director of instruction was necessary, and the third expressed regret for not being able to send a teacher list but enclosed a list of principals' names. Thus, in order to reach the senior high school English teachers in the eight counties which did not provide a list, it became necessary to contact the principals of their schools, so the Florida Educational Directory was consulted for the names and schools of these principals.

Private senior high school English teachers in the thirteen counties were also reached through the principals of their schools. English Education professors were reached through the deans of their colleges, divisions or schools. Supervisors of English were contacted directly. Thus, the several kinds of personnel involved in this survey include: 1) public senior high school (grades 9-12,10-12) English teachers, 2) private senior high school English teachers, 3) public school principals, 4) private school principals and headmasters, 5) Language Arts supervisors, 6) professors of English Education, and 7) deans of Education.

How the Survey Was Conducted

Pilot Study

In early March, 1971, a two-page questionnaire was sent to a random sample of ten Alachua County senior high school English teachers as a pilot study (see appendix). After two weeks only five of the ten questionnaires had been returned, so each of the nonrespondents was called to find out why he or she had not responded. The first said

she had been so busy making new semester adjustments that she had forgotten about it. The second had quit teaching before she received the questionnaire and was in the process of moving; consequently, she too had forgotten about it. The third misplaced the questionnaire. The fourth said she did not receive a return envelope, and there was no return address. The fifth felt she should not respond because she had retired the previous October. Upon consideration of the above reasons for not responding, it was decided that for the actual samples, two extra measures would be taken with the questionnaire and accompanying letter: 1) The respondent would be asked to return the questionnaire as soon as possible in order to assure getting the high percentage of returns needed for sample validity (80%), and 2) The questionnaire would be put inside the return envelope to lessen the chance that either would be lost.

Language Arts Supervisors

The first group in the target population to be sampled were the Language Arts supervisors. Again consulting the Florida Educational Directory, it was found that Brevard, Leon, Palm Beach, Santa Rosa, and Seminole counties list no supervisors or consultants at all. Alachua, Dade, Escambia, Hillsborough, and Pinellas list one; Orange lists two; Duval lists three; and Broward lists four. Questionnaires were sent to all fourteen of these persons, as well as to the President of the Florida Council of Teachers of English and to the Director of Community Resources in Pinellas County.

Private Schools

The next group to receive questionnaires were the private school teachers. As mentioned above, these teachers were reached by writing

to the principals of their schools. Each principal in the sample received a letter explaining the project, a return envelope containing a slip of paper, and a packet containing a letter and a questionnaire for the one teacher in each private school's sample (see appendices). In order to help assure an unbiased selection of this one teacher, the principal was asked to have his secretary pick that English teacher whose last name begins with the letter closest to the letter "N." This name was to be placed on the packet, and the packet to be placed in that person's mail box. This name was then to be written on the slip of paper contained in the return envelope and mailed back to the person conducting the survey, so that he could correspond directly with the teacher should he or she be a nonrespondent.

Inasmuch as the number of English teachers in each private school was unknown, an estimate was derived from computing the ratio of English teachers to total teacher population in each of the thirty-six senior high schools in the five counties from which teacher data had been received. This ratio, 1:6.5, when applied to the total number of teachers (817), produced an estimate of 126 English teachers in the twenty-three private schools.[1] In order to obtain the desired 10% sample, it was decided that questionnaires would be sent to 15%, so that if only 70% of the teachers respond, there would still be more than 10% of the population represented. Since most of the private schools were small and not likely to have more than one or two English teachers, a decision was made to contact one teacher in each of twenty schools, for a twenty teacher sample. The three schools not used were eliminated randomly.

---

[1] The estimate of English teachers in Table 2 is 136 rather than 126. This higher number is the cumulative result of taking a 1:6.5 ratio of English teachers to total faculty in each school, then rounding off.

English Education Professors

The next group to receive questionnaires were the English .
Education professors. These persons were contacted by sending packets
of questionnaires to the deans of all schools, divisions, and colleges
of Education listed in the Florida Educational Directory. The colleges
and universities listed as having divisions of Education are: 1)
Florida A and M University, 2) Florida Atlantic University, 3) Florida
State University, 4) Florida Technical University, 5) University of
Florida, 6) University of South Florida, 7) University of West Florida,
8) Jacksonville University, 9) Rollins College, 10) Stetson University,
and 11) University of Miami. Florida International University is also
listed but was not used because no additional information about this
institution was available. Inasmuch as professorial opinion was sought
only as supplementary information, no effort was made to identify the
population of English Education professors in Florida.

The letter enclosed with the three packets of questionnaires sent
to each dean simply asked that the packets be given to "any and all
English or Language Arts Education professors" (see appendix). It was
not until a letter arrived indicating that the questionnaires had been
given to two professors of English that the ambiguity of the letter sent
to the deans became apparent. What had been intended to mean just
Language Arts professors had apparently been read to mean English
professors or Language Arts professors. Since the orientation of English
professors is entirely different from that of Education professors, a
letter and return envelope were quickly dispatched to each of the eleven
deans explaining the problem and asking that he indicate on an enclosed
form which kind of professor had received the questionnaire (see letter
and form in appendices).

From the ten deans who replied, the information was as follows:

1) Florida Atlantic University- All questionnaires were given to English Education professors.

2) Florida State University- All to English Education professors.

3) Florida Technical University- All to English Education professors.

4) University of Florida- All to English Education professors.

5) University of South Florida- All to English Education professors.

6) University of West Florida- The chairman of the Faculty of English at this college had sent a letter earlier indicating that the questionnaires had been given to two members of his faculty. The chairman of Education, who had not been told about the letter from the Faculty of English, indicated on his form that all questionnaires had been given to English Education professors. He also included this note: "In our institution English Education is a part of the Faculty of English's responsibility. For that reason I gave the material to the Chairman of that Faculty."

7) Jacksonville University- All to English Education professors.

8) Rollins College- Two went to professors of English, one to a professor of Education.

9) Stetson University- The return envelope from this institution contained only a note from the chairman of Education: ". . . Any questionnaire you receive from Stetson will be from Arts and Science professors. We do not have English Education professors. All of the instruction in English is by members of the English Department, and I would say that this is the practice that is followed by all colleges except those that

have Colleges of Education. This fact might help to resolve
your problems."

10) University of Miami- "One or two" were given to Arts and
Science English professors.

Public School Teachers

Each public senior high school's proportion of its county sample
was made commensurate to that school's proportion of the senior high
English teacher population in that county. The county's proportion
of the thirteen county sample was made commensurate to that county's
proportion of the senior high English teacher population of the
thirteen county area (i.e., if school A had 10% of the senior high
English teachers in the county, then 10% of the county sample was
taken from school A. If county A had 10% of the senior high English
teachers in the thirteen county area, then 10% of the thirteen county
sample was taken from county A).

As for the five counties from which teacher lists had been received,
a random sampling was selected by picking names from a hat. Each of these
teachers was sent a questionnaire. The senior high schools in the eight
counties for which there were no teacher lists were dealt with in almost
exactly the same manner as with the private schools--by corresponding with
the principals. The only difference in procedure was that the public senior
high school principals were not given a randomization procedure to follow.
The small number of private school questionnaires which had been
returned up to that point suggested that perhaps those principal's
instructions had been too complicated. Therefore, the public school
principals were simply asked to provide assistance "in reaching a

-39-

random sample of English teachers" in their schools (see letter in appendix).

Follow-up Procedures

The nonrespondents on the teacher lists were simply sent a follow-up letter. For the private school teachers, the procedure involved either 1) sending letters and second questionnaires to those persons named on the slips returned by the principals, or 2) sending letters and second questionnaires to those principals who had not responded.

For those public school teachers whose names had been sent in by their principals, follow-up became very difficult because there was no way to distinguish respondents from nonrespondents in those schools from which questionnaires had been returned; thus, in order to reach those who had not responded, a special follow-up letter had to be sent (see appendix). To those principals who did not respond, a letter was sent (see appendix).

There were several schools from which questionnaires were returned but which sent no name slip, but only one of these failed to return all of the questionnaires, so no follow-up letter was necessary for this sub-group. A principal in one other school had sent a letter saying that the questionnaires had been given out, but that he could not supply the names of those teachers to whom they had been given. However, since none of the questionnaires were returned, no follow-up letters were sent. Supervisors, like professors, were not sampled; therefore, no follow-up letters were sent to these two groups.

Results of the Survey

As explained in the previous section, the survey of the target population was conducted in five stages. The supervisors were surveyed first; the private school teachers second; the professors third; the public school teachers on county lists, fourth; and the public school teachers for whom there were no lists, fifth. The results of the survey are reported in a series of tables containing data from the items on the questionnaire. For each set of two or three items covered in each table, the responses of supervisors and all teachers are given for each county in the target population (Tables 4 - 13). Table 2 gives the populations, sample sizes, and numbers of respondents for both teacher groups and supervisors. Table 3 shows, for each group, what percentage of the questionnaires sent was returned, and what percentage of the population is represented by the returned questionnaires. Table 14 gives the responses of all professors to all items on the questionnaire. In Table 15, the total number of responses to each questionnaire item for all groups is given (grand totals).

In preparing for the survey, it was decided that a 10% proportional, random sampling of the teacher population would constitute a statistically valid sample, provided that at least 80% of the questionnaires sent were returned.[2] As Tables 2 and 3 indicate, responses from 10% of the teachers was secured from a 70% return of questionnaires. For individual counties the response ranged from the 3% sample/17% return for Seminole County to the 15% sample/100% return for Alachua County. Therefore, in

---

[2] The sampling procedures for the teacher populations are discussed on pp. 34-35 and 38-39.

TABLE 2

English Supervisors, Public Senior High School English Teachers,
and Private Senior High School English Teachers:
Populations, Sample Sizes and Numbers of Respondents

County	Population			Sample Size			No. of Respondents		
	Grp.1[a]	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
Alachua	1	27	--	1	4	--	1	4	--
Brevard	--[b]	107	7	--	16	2	--	11	2
Broward	4	234	23	4	35	4	4	27	4
Dade	1	384	48	1	58	7	1	42	3
Duval	3	143	11	3	21	1	2	15	0
Escambia	1	96	7	1	15	1	1	9	1
Hillsborough	1	181	14	1	24	2	1	15	2
Leon	--	63	--	--	10	--	--	3	--
Orange	2	126	9	2	19	1	1	18	1
Palm Beach	--	105	8	--	15	1	--	12	0
Pinellas	1	178	9	1	24	1	1	20	1
Santa Rosa	--	17	--	--	4	--	--	1	--
Seminole	--	39	--	--	6	--	--	1	--
Totals	14	1,700[c]	136[d]	14	251	20	12	178	14

[a]Group 1 = Supervisors
Group 2 = Public School Teachers
Group 3 = Private School Teachers
[b]-- = No personnel in this category
[c]The figures for the eight counties who sent no teacher list are approximations
based on the 1:6.5 ratio discussed on p. 34.
[d]This figure is a total ratio approximation (1:6.5) of English teachers to total
faculty in each school. See explanation at bottom of p.34.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Questionnaires Returned and Percentage of
Supervisor and Teacher Population Represented By the
Returned Questionnaires

County	Percentage of Questionnaires Returned			Percentage of Population Represented by the Returned Questionnaires		
	Grp.1[a]	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
Alachua	100	100	--	100	15	--
Brevard	--[b]	69	100	--	10	29
Broward	100	77	100	100	12	17
Dade	100	72	43	100	11	6
Duval	67	71	0	67	10	0
Escambia	100	60	100	100	9	14
Hillsborough	100	63	100	100	10	14
Leon	--	30	--	--	5	--
Orange	50	95	100	50	14	11
Palm Beach	--	80	0	--	11	0
Pinellas	100	83	100	100	11	11
Santa Rosa	--	25	--	--	6	--
Seminole	--	17	--	--	3	--
Group Percentage	86[c]	70	70	86	10	10

[a] Group 1 = Supervisors
   Group 2 = Public School Teachers
   Group 3 = Private School Teachers
[b] -- = No personnel in this category
[c] These figures represent the ratio of total respondents to total sample, and
   that of total respondents to total population.

consideration of the criteria established before the survey was conducted; the validity of the overall sample for the public school teachers would have to be regarded as at least questionable, and the validity of those individual counties which fall below the average, doubtful. As for the private school group, the fact that only one teacher from each school was selected, albeit randomly, makes the validity of its overall sample questionable at best. However, while it may not be possible to speak for the whole teacher population with statistical confidence, the judgements of these sample professionals do constitute a valuable testimony as to the worth of community oriented English.

The first item on the questionnaire asked the respondent to indicate whether or not he has had or plans to have experience using the independent study method with his classes (Table 4). Like many other items used in the questionnaire, "independent study" is a vaguely defined term in wide usage among educators, a fact which makes any response to questions about the practice to some extent a reflection of the individual respondent's bias with regard to independent study. This item was included in the survey to determine what, if any, connection there would be between having or not having independent study teaching experience; and validating or not validating community oriented English. There was also an interest in determining if respondents with such experience would more frequently choose "independent study" as a most important "element." A comparison of the data in Tables 2, 4, 5 and 6 shows no appreciable correlation between the percentage of respondents with such experience and the percentage who voted for practicability, or for independent study as a most important item. In Brevard County, for

TABLE 4

Supervisors and Teachers Who Have Had or Plan to Have
Experience Using the Independent Study Method with Their Classes

County	Supervisors	Public School Teachers	Private School Teachers
Alachua	1	2	-
Brevard	_a	10	1
Broward	2	15	2
Dade	1	34	1
Duval	0	9	N.R.[b]
Escambia	1	2	0
Hillsborouth	0	10	2
Leon	-	1	-
Orange	0	7	1
Palm Beach	-	9	N.R.
Pinellas	1	11	1
Santa Rosa	-	1	-
Seminole	-	0	-
Totals	6	111	8

[a] - = No personnel in this category

[b] N.R. = No respondents

example, 84.7% of the respondents marked the independent study experience item; 92.4% voted for practicability; and 23.1% marked "independent study" as "most." The percentages for Broward County for the same items were 54.3%, 88.66%, and 14.3%. For Duval County they were 52.9%, 82.32%, and 0%. For Escambia County they were 27%, 72% and 9%. Thus, the variation and lack of pattern in these statistics, which are typical of those for the other nine counties, suggest a lack of correlation between having independent study experience and voting "yes" to practicability or "most" to "independent study."

In Table 5 the answers to the central question of the survey are tabulated. Here, for each county in the thirteen-county target area, are given the numbers of supervisors and teachers who judged community oriented English instruction to be "practicable" or not. A number of the respondents made (unsolicited) comments and qualifying statements in conjunction with their responses to certain questionnaire items. Among those made in connection with the practicability question ("Do you believe such a program is practicable?"), are the following:

1) (No)--"Not with our present method of scheduling" (private school teacher).

2) (No)--"Define 'community'--no, not yet" (supervisor).

3) (Yes)--"Only if students are mature enough to accept responsibility _individually_" (public school teacher).

4) (Yes)--"Particularly for terminal H.S. students" (public school teacher).

5) (No)--"We had one in science last year, and apparently it worked quite well. The class _must_ be quite small, which apparently is impossible in our community. A teacher cannot

TABLE 5

Teachers Who Believe Community Oriented English Instruction
Is Practicable/Not Practicable

County	Practicable			Not Practicable		
	Grp.1[a]	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
Alachua	1	3	--	0	1	--
Brevard	--[b]	10	2	--	1	0
Broward	3	25	3	1	2	1
Dade	1	36	3	0	5	0
Duval	1	13	N.R.[b]	0	2	N.R.
Escambia	0	7	1	1	1	0
Hillsborough	1	14	2	0	1	0
Leon	--	3	--	--	0	--
Orange	0	15	1	1	2	0
Palm Beach	--	9	N.R.	--	2	N.R.
Pinellas	1	16	1	0	3	0
Santa Rosa	--	1	--	--	0	--
Seminole	--	0	--	--	1	--
Totals	8	152	13	3	21	1

[a] Group 1 = Supervisors
Group 2 = Public School Teachers
Group 3 = Private School Teachers

[b] -- = No personnel in this category

[c] N.R. = No respondents

supervise 30 to 35 students under such a program when she must
teach 4 other classes" (public school teacher).

6) (Yes)—"Partially, dealing with Journalism as well as English"
(public school teacher).

7) (Yes)—"Some of the best stuff I know of on this is happening
in the Illinois State program for 'the gifted'" (professor).

8) (No)—"Not in this school. You didn't ask for this, but here
it is anyhow. This school and community are vocationally
oriented and my students in the 11th and 12th grades get
working papers when they are old enough and 2/3 to 3/4 of them
work afternoons :/o evenings. Go to the library? Never, except
on regular classtime. Study without supervision? Not these,
except in vocational classes. I do not think these students
would be interested in any 'community resources' unless it or
they put money in their pockets" (public school teacher).

9) (Yes)—"For students who want to drop out of school" (public
school teacher).

10) (Yes)—"But not nec. superior" (public school teacher).

11) (Yes)—"Staying in the classroom is most practical for mass
public education in high school. I think it is a great idea
for select classes in high school and most college English
classes" (public school teacher).

For those respondents who did think such a program is practicable,
a series of terms were listed on page two of the questionnaire. They
were to mark two of these terms "most" and two "least" important to the
success of community oriented English instruction. In Table 6 the
findings for "independent study," "individualized instruction" and

TABLE 6

Supervisors and Teachers Who Judged "Independent Study,"
"Individualized Instruction," and "Flexible Scheduling"
as Most/Least Important to the Success of
Community Oriented English Instruction

County	Independent Study			Individualized Instruction			Flexible Scheduling		
	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
	M[a] L[b]	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L
Alachua	0 0	0 0	- -	0 0	0 0	- -	0 0	0 0	- -
Brevard	c- -	3 0	0 0	- -	1 1	0 0	. -	1 1	0 0
Broward	0 0	4 1	1 1	1 0	4 0	0 0	1 0	9 0	1 0
Dade	0 0	12 1	0 0	0 0	8 0	0 0	0 0	8 0	3 0
Duval	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	3 2	0 0	0 0	5 0	0 0
Escambia	0 0	1 0	0 0	0 0	3 0	0 0	0 0	1 0	0 0
Hillsborough	0 0	2 0	0 0	0 0	2 0	1 0	0 0	4 0	1 0
Leon	- -	0 0	- -	- -	3 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Orange	0 0	7 0	0 0	0 0	2 0	0 0	0 0	3 0	1 0
Palm Beach	- -	2 1	0 0	- -	0 0	0 0	- -	4 1	0 0
Pinellas	0 0	1 1	0 0	0 0	1 0	0 0	0 0	5 1	1 0
Santa Rosa	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Seminole	- -	- 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Totals	0 0	32 4	1 1	1 0	27 3	1 0	1 0	40 3	7 0

[a]M = Most

[b]L = Least

[c]- = No personnel in this category

flexible scheduling" are given. These terms, like all the others in this list, were included because they were judged by the person conducting the survey (based on his readings) to have some relevancy and importance to the conduct of any Parkway-type school program.

With regard to these particular items it came as a surprise to learn that "independent study" and "individualized instruction" received less "most" votes than did "flexible scheduling."

The three items in Table 7 all received more "least" votes than "most." The fact that "eligibility requirements" was accorded least importance by a margin of two to one over "most" suggests that the general consensus among supervisors and teachers is, that the Parkway-type program can be used profitably with students at all ability levels. That "special school plant facilities" should receive such a heavy majority of "least" votes suggests that the respondents feel that any program which maximizes use of community resources would therefore minimize school resources. Perhaps it did not occur to them that certain school facilities, such as study carrels or small conference rooms, might expedite usage of community resources.

Table 8 gives the statistics for the two items which were judged to be most and least important to the success of community oriented English: "flexible school program" (most) and "computer scheduling" (least). Tables 9 and 10 show that "additional guidance services," "community-school relations director," "teacher's community relations council," and "citizens' advisory council" all received substantially more "least" votes than "most." The figures for "special transportation facilities," interestingly enough, were divided almost equally between the two (21 "most"/23 "least"). The two items covered in Table 11, "unified school dedication" and "unified community dedication," were

TABLE 7

Supervisors and Teachers Who Judged "Eligibility Requirements,"
"Special School Plant Facilities," and "Special Learning
Materials" as Most/Least Important to the Success
of Community Oriented English Instruction

County	Eligibility Requirements			Special School Plant Facilities			Special Learning Materials		
	Grp.1[a]	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
	M[b] L[c]	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L
Alachua	0 1	0 1	-- --	0 1	0 1	-- --	0 0	0 0	-- --
Brevard	-- --[d]	1 1	0 1	-- --	0 1	0 1	-- --	1 1	0 0
Broward	0 1	5 2	0 0	0 1	0 9	0 1	0 0	3 3	0 1
Dade	0 0	2 6	0 1	0 1	3 7	0 1	0 0	3 5	0 0
Duval	0 0	0 2	0 0	0 1	0 7	0 0	0 1	0 1	0 0
Escambia	0 0	1 2	0 1	0 0	0 2	0 0	0 0	1 1	1 0
Hillsborough	0 0	1 4	0 0	0 0	0 6	0 0	0 0	0 1	0 0
Leon	-- --	0 1	-- --	-- --	0 0	-- --	-- --	0 0	-- --
Orange	0 0	3 0	0 0	0 0	0 3	0 1	0 0	1 0	0 0
Palm Beach	-- --	1 1	0 0	-- --	0 2	0 0	-- --	0 0	0 0
Pinellas	0 0	3 5	0 0	0 1	0 3	0 0	0 1	0 1	0 0
Santa Rosa	-- --	0 1	-- --	-- --	0 1	-- --	-- --	1 0	-- --
Seminole	-- --	0 0	-- --	-- --	0 0	-- --	-- --	0 0	-- --
Totals	0 2	17 26	0 3	0 5	3 42	0 4	0 2	10 13	1 1

[a]Group 1 = Supervisors
  Group 2 = Public School Teachers
  Group 3 = Private School Teachers

[b]M = Most
[c]L = Least
[d]-- = No personnel in this category

TABLE 8

Supervisors and Teachers Who Judged "Curriculum Changes,"
"Flexible School Program" and "Computer Scheduling"
as Most/Least Important to the Success
of Community Oriented English Instruction

County	Curriculum Changes			Flexible School Program			Computer Scheduling		
	Grp.1[a]	Grp. 2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
	M[b] L[c]	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L
Alachua	0 0	0 0	- -	0 0	2 0	- -	0 0	0 2	- -
Brevard	- -[d]	2 0	2 0	- -	4 0	0 0	- -	0 3	0 1
Broward	0 0	1 0	0 0	2 0	7 0	3 0	0 1	0 7	0 1
Dade	0 0	8 0	1 1	0 0	12 1	1 0	0 1	0 6	0 2
Duval	0 0	4 0	0 0	0 0	7 0	0 0	0 0	0 4	0 0
Escambia	0 0	1 0	0 0	0 0	4 0	1 0	0 0	0 2	0 1
Hillsborough	0 1	1 1	0 0	0 0	7 0	0 0	0 1	0 4	0 0
Leon	- -	0 0	- -	- -	3 0	- -	- -	0 3	- -
Orange	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	5 0	0 0	0 0	0 9	0 0
Palm Beach	- -	3 0	0 0	- -	2 0	0 0	- -	0 2	0 0
Pinellas	0 0	5 0	1 0	0 0	5 0	0 0	0 0	0 4	0 1
Santa Rosa	- -	0 0	- -	- -	1 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Seminole	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Totals	0 1	25 1	4 1	2 0	59 1	5 0	0 3	0 46	0 6

[a]Group 1 = Supervisors
Group 2 = Public School Teachers
Group 3 = Private School Teachers
[b]M = Most
[c]L = Least
[c]- = No personnel in this category

TABLE 9

Supervisors and Teachers Who Judged "Additional Guidance Services,"
"Special Transportation Facilities," and "Community-School
Relations Director" as Most/Least Important
to the Success of Community Oriented English Instruction

County	Additional Guidance Services			Special Transportation Facilities			Community-School Relations Director		
	Grp.1[a]	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
	M[b] L[c]	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L
Alachua	0 0	0 0	- -	0 0	1 1	- -	1 0	1 1	- -
Brevard	- -[d]	0 2	1 0	- -	2 2	0 0	- -	1 2	0 0
Broward	0 0	0 8	0 0	0 1	4 2	1 0	0 2	4 6	1 0
Dade	0 0	0 12	0 1	0 0	7 4	0 0	0 0	2 7	0 0
Duval	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 3	0 0	0 0	3 1	0 0
Escambia	0 0	0 2	0 0	0 0	1 1	0 0	0 0	0 1	0 0
Hillsborough	0 0	1 0	0 1	1 0	0 3	0 1	0 0	3 2	1 0
Leon	- -	0 1	- -	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 1	- -
Orange	0 0	0 4	0 0	0 0	2 1	0 1	0 0	0 5	1 0
Palm Beach	- -	0 1	0 0	- -	2 2	0 0	- -	4 2	0 0
Pinellas	0 0	0 3	0 0	0 0	0 1	0 0	0 0	2 2	0 0
Santa Rosa	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Seminole	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Totals	0 0	1 33	1 2	1 1	19 20	1 2	1 2	20 30	3 0

[a] Group 1 = Supervisors
Group 2 = Public School Teachers
Group 3 = Private School Teachers

[b] M = Most
[c] L = Least
[d] - = No personnel in this category

TABLE 10

Supervisors and Teachers Who Judged "Teachers' Community Relations Council" and "Citizens' Advisory Council" as Most/Least Important to the Success of Community Oriented English Instruction

County	Teachers' Community Relations Council			Citizens' Advisory Council		
	Grp.1[a]	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
	M[b] L[c]	M L	M L	M L	M L	M L
Alachua	0 0	0 0	- -	0 0	0 0	- -
Brevard	- -[d]	0 3	0 0	- -	0 2	0 1
Broward	0 0	1 3	0 1	0 0	0 5	0 1
Dade	0 0	0 4	0 0	0 0	0 16	0 0
Duval	1 0	2 2	0 0	0 0	0 4	0 0
Escambia	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 3	0 0
Hillsborough	0 0	0 1	0 1	0 0	0 4	0 1
Leon	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Orange	0 0	1 1	0 0	0 0	0 4	0 0
Palm Beach	0 0	0 1	0 0	0 0	0 5	0 0
Pinellas	0 0	2 2	0 0	0 0	0 3	0 0
Santa Rosa	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Seminole	- -	0 0	- -	- -	0 0	- -
Totals	1 0	6 17.	0 2	0 0	0 45	0 3

[a]Group 1 = Supervisors
Group 2 = Public School Teachers
Group 3 = Private School Teachers

[b]M = Most
[c]L = Least
[d]- = No personnel in this category

TABLE 11

Supervisors and Teachers Who Judged "Unified School Dedication to the
Community School Philosophy" and "Unified Community Dedication to the
Community School Philosophy as Most/Least Important to
Community Oriented English Instruction

| County | Unified School Dedication | | | | | | Unified Community Dedication | | | | | |
| | Grp.1[a] | | Grp.2 | | Grp.3 | | Grp.1 | | Grp.2 | | Grp.3 | |
	M[b]	L[c]	M	L	M	L	M	L	M	L	M	L
Alachua	1	0	1	0	-	-	0	0	1	0	-	-
Brevard	-[d]	-	2	0	0	0	-	-	2	0	0	0
Broward	1	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	5	1	0	0
Dade	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	0
Duval	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Escambia	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hillsborough	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0
Leon	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-
Orange	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0
Palm Beach	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0
Pinellas	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
Santa Rosa	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-
Seminole	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-
Totals	5	0	19	2	0	0	4	0	17	4	2	1

[a]Group 1 = Supervisors
Group 2 = Public School Teachers
Group 3 = Private School Teachers

[b]M = Most
[c]L = Least
[d]- = No personnel in this category

generally ignored by the respondents, receiving only 54 of the 692 "most/least" votes cast by these three groups, but those who did accord them most importance tended to feel strongly about that importance.

The following are a number of the comments and qualifying statements made about the "elements" section of the questionnaire:

1) (Did not understand the difference between "flexible scheduling" and "a highly flexible school program"-professor).

2) (Comment made with reference to "a teachers' community relations council"): [Should be] composed of teachers and members of community--(most)" (public school teacher).

3) ("curriculum changes"): "automatically necessary, wouldn't you say?"
   ("additional guidance services"): "would be helpful" (public school teacher).

4) ("additional guidance services"): "least!!" (public school teacher).

5) "I feel [unified school dedication] and [unified community dedication] must exist before anything else takes place. I would then choose [flexible school program] and [individualized instruction]" (public school teacher).

In section three of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to indicate which of four statements best describes the attitude their respective communities would likely have toward community oriented education. Inasmuch as professors are not oriented to a particular community in the same way supervisors and teachers are, their instructions were amended to read "that setting where you provide pre-service and/or in-service education." The responses to this

query are given in Tables 12 and 13 for the supervisors and teachers, and Table 14 for the professors, a table containing the responses of all professors to all items on the questionnaire. Some of the comments made in conjunction with responses in this section are the following:

1) "I cannot honestly [choose a statement] . I have 37 secondary schools each in its unique community" (supervisor).

2) ("Both the school and the community are likely to favor such a program"): "If scheduling problems could be worked out" (private school teacher).

3) ("Both. . ."): "in limited program" (public school teacher).

4) ("Both. . ."): "Cocoa High is the pilot school in Brevard County for the community school concept" (public school teacher).

5) ("Both. . ."): "However--there would likely be hesitation on both sides but aggreement [sic] could be reached" (public school teacher).

6) ("Neither the school nor the community is likely to favor such a program"): "I can see and do utilize a combination of class-room and community resources in my classes. (I emphasize combination though)" (public school teacher).

A number of the respondents made comments about several aspects of the questionnaire, and about the curriculum concept. Many of these are given below:

1) "Despite the fact I answered "no" on page one, I am still answering this part. Your terms are still stated in "educationese"-- I'm a man 60 yrs. old, have been at this business a long time, but I'm young enough to realize we do need a change in English requirements and offerings."

TABLE 12

Supervisors and Teachers Who Judged "The School Is More Likely
to Favor Such a Program than Is the Community" or "The Community
Is More Likely to Favor Such a Program than Is the School" as
the Statement which Best Describes the Situation in Their
Particular School-Community Settings

County	The School Is More Likely			The Community Is More Likely		
	Grp.1[a]	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
Alachua	1	2	-	0	0	-
Brevard	-[b]	4	1	-	1	0
Broward	2	7	1	1	2	0
Dade	0	7	0	0	5	2
Duval	0	7	0	0	1	0
Escambia	0	2	0	0	0	0
Hillsborough	0	3	0	0	3	0
Leon	-	0	-	-	0	-
Orange	1	7	1	0	2	0
Palm Beach	-	3	0	-	1	0
Pinellas	0	4	1	0	2	0
Santa Rosa	-	0	-	-	0	-
Seminole	-	1	-	-	0	-
Totals	4	47	4	1	17	2

[a]Group 1 = Supervisors
Group 2 = Public School Teachers
Group 3 = Private School Teachers

[b]- = No personnel in this category

TABLE 13

Supervisors and Teachers Who Judged "Both the School and the Community
Are Likely to Favor Such a Program" or "Neither The School Nor the
Community is Likely to Favor Such a Program" as the Statement
Which Best Describes the Situation in Their Particular
School-Community Settings

County	Both the School and the Community			Neither the School Nor the Community		
	Grp.1[a]	Grp.2	Grp.3	Grp.1	Grp.2	Grp.3
Alachua	0	1	--	0	1	--
Brevard	--[b]	6	0	--	0	0
Broward	1	11	3	0	7	0
Dade	1	18	1	0	5	0
Duval	1	5	0	0	2	0
Escambia	0	3	1	1	3	0
Hillsborough	0	5	2	0	4	0
Leon	--	1	--	--	1	--
Orange	0	5	0	0	2	0
Palm Beach	--	4	0	--	3	0
Pinellas	1	10	0	0	3	0
Santa Rosa	--	1	--	--	0	--
Seminole	--	0	--	--	0	--
Totals	4	70	7	1	31	0

[a]Group 1 = Supervisors
Group 2 = Public School Teachers
Group 3 = Private School Teachers

[b]-- = No personnel in this category

TABLE 14

Survey Questionnaire Responses of English and
English Education Professors
[N = 18: English Education (E.E.) - 12, English (E.) - 3
Status Unknown (U.) - 3][a]

"If you have ever utilized the independent study method with your classes,
or are now using it, or have made plans to use it, please mark . . . ."

___14___   (E.E. - 10, E. - 2, U. - 2)

"Do you believe community oriented English instruction is practicable?"

___16___   Yes (E.E. - 11, E. - 3, U. - 2)

___1___   No   (E.E. - 1, E. - 0, U. - 0)

"If you answered 'yes' . . . , which of the [following items] do you think
are most and least important to the success of such a program? (Mark two
items 'Most' and two items 'Least.')."

"an independent study program"

___4___   Most   (E.E. - 4, E. - 0, U. - 0)

___0___   Least

"individualized instruction"

___5___   Most   (E.E. - 3, E. - 1, U. - 1)

___0___   Least

"flexible scheduling"

___4___   Most   (E.E. - 2, E. - 2, U. - 0)

___0___   Least

"eligibility requirements"

___1___   Most   (E.E. - 0, E. - 1, U. - 0)

___3___   Least (E.E. - 2, E. - 1, U. - 0)

----

[a]see the discussion on pages 35-37 on how these distinctions were made.

TABLE 14 (continued)

"special school plant facilities"

___0___ Most

___6___ Least (E.E. - 5, E. - 1, U. - 0)

"special learning materials"

___0___ Most

___1___ Least (E.E. - 1, E. - 0, U. - 0)

"curriculum changes"

___0___ Most

___0___ Least

"highly flexible school program"

___5___ Most (E.E. - 3, E. - 1, U. - 1)

___0___ Least

"computer scheduling and record keeping"

___0___ Most

___7___ Least (E.E. - 4, E. - 2, U. - 1)

"additional guidance services"

___0___ Most

___4___ Least (E.E. - 4, E. - 0, U. - 0)

"special transportation facilities"

___0___ Most

___1___ Least (E.E. - 1, E. - 0, U. - 0)

"a community-school relations director on the school staff"

___1___ Most (E.E. - 1, E. - 0, U. - 0)

___2___ Least (E.E. - 1, E. - 1, U. - 0)

"a teachers' community relations council"

___0___ Most

___0___ Least

TABLE 14 (continued)

"a citizens' advisory council"

____0____ Most

____4____ Least (E.E. - 2, E. - 1, U. - 1)

"unified school dedication to the community-school philosophy"

____4____ Most (E.E. - 4, E. - 0, U. - 0)

____0____ Least

"unified community dedication to the community-school philosophy"

____4____ Most (E.E. - 3, E. - 1, U. - 0)

__0__ Least

"Feasibility - mark the statement below which best describes the situation in your particular school-community setting (a setting in which you have experience conducting pre-service and/or in-service educational programs)":

1. "The school is more likely to favor such a program than is the community."

____6____ (E.E. - 5, E. - 1, U. - 0)

2. "The community is more likely to favor such a program than is the school."

____2____ (E.E. - 1, E. - 1, U. - 0)

3. "Both the school and the community are likely to favor such a program."

____5____ (E.E. - 3, E. - 1, U. - 1)

4. "Neither the school nor the community is likely to favor such a program."

____1____ (E.E. - 1, E. - 0, U. - 0)

"Mark in the following space if you would like to have a copy of the findings of this research."

____13____ (E.E. - 11, E. - 2, U. - 0)

("special learning materials"): "Unimportant, the principal

requirement is a good teacher."

("unified school dedication"): "Surely, but how?"

("unified community dedication"): "of course"

"This area has grown so rapidly, is changing so rapidly even

now, that the school, unfortunately, seems to be the least

concern of 90% of the parents, e.g., on Parent-Teacher con-

ference days and nights, to which the school board still devotes

approximately 40-50 hours of teacher time per year, we have a

turn-out of parents of much, much less than 5%" (public school

teacher).

2) "I found the questionnaire very difficult—maybe it is not the

questionnaire but the <u>decisions</u> one must make about most-least

are difficult. I follow the principle that <u>personnel</u> is always

an important consideration and <u>requirements</u> less important.

Why didn't you include an open-ended item?" (professor).

3) "I do not understand [the connection between 'experience using

independent study' and 'maximum use of community resources'] as

a unique method. Hence, I cannot respond—sorry" (professor).

4) "I am assuming that [independent study program] presupposes b.,

c., f., g., etc.; and, that "p." presupposes m., n., o., and

especially l. [community school relations director]. If the

students and teachers are with it, l. becomes another drain on

teacher salaries" (professor).

5) This person added as one of his choices, "Creative teachers—

most" (professor).

6) "Why didn't you define 'English'? As long as you're stuck

with traditional definitions of so-called 'subjects' you'll

have impossible difficulties in turning the community into a
classroom. A classroom activity probably couldn't achieve the
objective I would have."

("curriculum changes"): "Whose curriculum? A program like
this would have to stand outside and separate from the traditional
school. Kids attending could 'drop in' for traditional courses
if they wanted to."

("citizens' advisory council"): "definitely needed"
"We have been trying to get something like this going by
working with the Model Cities people. I have serious doubts
that anything will happen because neither the community nor
the school bureaucracy seems to understand the concept. You
might write to Don Taylor, director of the Tampa Model Cities
Education Component, 707 E. Columbus Dr. for a copy of the
'Project Self' proposal" (professor).

7) "I don't feel I know enough about [the survey topic] to
answer your questions satisfactorily" (public school teacher).

8) "After careful reading of the purpose and terms, most of our
faculty answering this questionnaire felt the first question,
as well as the entire questionnaire, is loaded in favor of a
particular idea. We are really not certain what you have in
mind in any case. Perhaps a re-wording of your questionnaire
would get more positive results" (public school teacher).

9) This person marked everything on the questionnaire from
"flexible scheduling" down as "least." For "most" he added
these two choices: "The desire and capability of the student";
"an interested teacher with time to react to and counsel the
student" (professor).

10) "None of these ["elements"] are completely valid. The emphasis
    is upon the initiative of the teacher" (public school teacher).

11) "I'm certified in English but am teaching Special Ed. Home
    Ec.--Sorry! I would have liked to help" (public school teacher).

12) "Sorry I can not help you. I am now involved in elementary
    education exclusively" (supervisor).

13) This person marked everything "least," and for "most," wrote in
    "smart teachers" and "smart administrators" (professor).

14) "I found it rather hard to draw a definite "most" or "least"
    answer as I feel practically all the choices are pertinent in
    arriving at a program that you wish to achieve" (public school
    teacher).

15) "Your project appears to be interesting; and is an idea I have
    been pushing for some time in this area. . ." (private school
    teacher).

16) "Many departments are using community resources--outside trips
    (research) and observations. Speakers come to school. English
    units have had good results in limited program--mostly speakers.
    Strongly believe in teaching aids. . ." (public school teacher).

17) "I've begun this kind of program on a very small scale. Would
    appreciate research findings" (President of Florida Council of
    Teachers of English).

18) "I would like further information on the practical aspects of
    such a program. What, exactly, is it? How does it work? How
    would it be put into effect? etc." (public school teacher).

19) "I am very interested in this type of program" (public school
    teacher).

TABLE 15

Total Number of Responses on Each Questionnaire Item:
Professors, Supervisors and Teachers (N = 225)[a]

Those who have used or plan to use independent study methods with their classes	143
Practicability of community oriented English instruction:	
Practicable	196
Non-practicable	26

"Elements" judged to be most/least important to the success of community oriented English instruction:

	Most	Least
"an independent study program"	38	6
"individualized instruction"	35	3
"flexible scheduling"	55	3
"eligibility requirements for student participation"	18	36
"special school plant facilities"	3	59
"special learning materials"	11	18
"curriculum changes"	30	3
"a highly flexible school program"	73	1
"a computer scheduling and record keeping"	0	65
"additional guidance services"	2	39
"special transportation facilities"	22	25
"a community-school relations director on the school staff"	27	37

[a] All persons who actually responded to the questionnaire items (not those who returned questionnaire unanswered). The figure includes with the supervisors, the responses of the Director of Community Resources in Pinellas County and those of the president of the Florida Council of Teachers of English. It also includes the responses of the five pilot project teachers who responded.

TABLE 15 (continued)

	Most	Least
"a teachers' community relations council"	7	19
"a citizens' advisory council"	0	54
"unified school dedication to the community-school philosophy"	29	2
"unified community dedication to the community-school philosophy"	29	5

Acceptability of community oriented English:

"The school is more likely to favor such a program than is the community."	65
"The community is more likely to favor such a program than is the school."	22
"Both the school and the community are likely to favor such a program."	89
"Neither the school nor the community is likely to favor such a program."	33

Total number of respondents who indicated they would like to have a copy of the research findings	137

Gross analysis of the data in all tables shows that the 176 public school teachers who responded voted overwhelmingly in favor of the practicability of community oriented English (152 yes, 21 no).[3] The "element" this group voted as most important to the success of such a program was "a highly flexible school program" (59 mosts). The least important were "computer scheduling and record keeping" (46 leasts) and "a citizens' advisory council" (46 leasts). The statement which best describes community-school relations for these teachers is "both the school and the community are likely to favor such a program" (70 votes).

The fourteen private school teachers also heartily endorsed the program (13 yes, 1 no); whereas the public school teachers picked "flexible school program" as most important, this group chose "flexible scheduling"(7 votes). The least important item to the private school teachers was "computer scheduling" (6 votes). "Both the school and the community are likely to favor. . ." is also the opinion of this group, as to the acceptability of the program.

The thirteen supervisors voted ten to three in favor of the program.[4] They believe "unified school dedication. . ." is the most important factor (6 votes), and that "special school plant facilities" is the least (6 votes). Like the other two groups, their opinion is that "both the school and the community are likely to favor such a program" (6 votes).

The Director of the Office of Community Resources for Pinellas County thinks the program is practicable and likely to be accepted by both the school and the community. The most important factors, in his

---

[3] Three respondents marked neither "yes" nor "no."

[4] Includes the responses of the Director of Community Resources in Pinellas County and those of the President of the Florida Council of Teachers of English.

judgement, are unified school and community dedication to the community school philosophy. The least important are, surprisingly enough, · "special transportation facilities," and "a community-school relations director on the school staff."

The seventeen responding professors endorsed the practicability of the program by a vote of sixteen to one. Unlike the other groups, however, they were not as decisive about which of the "elements" would be most important to the success of the program. The vote was split between "a highly flexible school program" and "individualized instruction" (5 votes each). The least important item, in their opinion, is "computer scheduling" (7 votes). As for the acceptability of community oriented English, they feel that "the school is more likely to favor such a program than is the community" (6 votes).

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the last few years, it has become difficult to read a newspaper with-
out encountering an article dealing with some new "crisis" in education. The
causes given for these crises and the suggested solutions are as numerous as
the articles themselves. One solution that has captured the imagination of
thousands of high school students and educators is to do away with the school
as a physical institution in the hope that all the evils of institutionalism
will be done away with at the same time. Whether or not society can function
better without the structure of institutionalized education remains to be seen.

This research study sought to determine how English educators view the
idea of de-institutionalizing the school by merging it with the community, to
determine what educational characteristics would be most important to the suc-
cess of such a venture, and to determine the extent to which the respective
communities of these educators would be inclined to accept such a blurring of
distinctions between what is school and what is not.

The results of the survey indicate that all English professionals sur-
veyed believe, by a margin of seven to one, that such a merger is possible,
and reply that flexibility of school schedule and program are necessary pre-
conditions to such a merger. Flexibility of program was the choice of the
public school teachers and the professors; flexible scheduling, the choice
of private school teachers. Supervisors chose "unified school dedication."

An analysis by county shows that the public school teachers in ten of
the thirteen counties marked as most important either "flexible program" (7
counties) or "flexible schedule" (2 counties). One county voted them equally
most important. Of the nine counties which have private senior high schools,

-69-

only five voted for flexible scheduling; but in one of these, Dade, three teachers voted for it, making a total of seven votes. Of the eight counties which have supervisors; one supervisor in four counties, and two in one county voted for "unified school dedication" (5 counties/6 votes), perhaps because as county supervisors they have to be more concerned with global considerations.

"Computer scheduling and record keeping" was judged to be least important to public and private school teachers and professors. Also for the public school teachers there was an equal number of negative votes for "a citizens' advisory council." Supervisors chose "special school plant facilities" as least important.

As for the acceptability question, "both the school and the community are likely to favor such a program" was the majority choice for teachers and supervisors, but the professors, by a narrow margin over "both. . .," chose "the school is more likely."

It would appear then that educators are not as defensive of the traditional school as one might expect. That this might be a reaction against bureaucratic regimentation and a loss of faith in educational paraphernalia is supported by the fact that "flexible schedule" and "flexible program," which are only two of sixteen items, received 23% of the "most" vote; and that "computer scheduling" and "special school facilities" received 23% of the "least" vote. A seemingly inconsistent attitude toward citizen participation is revealed in the fact that although 10% of the "least" votes were cast for "citizens' advisory council," 40% of the acceptability question votes were cast for "both the school and the community are likely to favor such a program." This may be indicative of an attitude which holds that educational use of human and material resources in the community is workable and desirable, so long as qualified teaching and supervisory

personnel retain control of the operation. This notion is supported
by the fact that several of the comments, especially from professors,
stress the importance of "smart teachers and administrators," "cre-
ative teachers," and students and teachers who are "with it."

Disenchantment with the public for its seeming lack of interest
is of course understandable in light of the public's failure to
patronize school-community activities (other than football games),
and its reluctance to ratify increased school expenditures, but this
could be because the public does not feel a sense of community with
the school. To a great many, the school is just another large,
impersonal governmental bureaucracy into which ever increasing amounts
of taxpayer money must be poured. Thus, the average citizen feels the
school needs his interest and participation about as much as does the
Internal Revenue Service or the Post Office Department; hence, it is
not surprising that the public appears uninterested. But what is
taken to be a lack of interest is quite possibly a disinterest, i.e., the
public is relegated to the status of consumers of a governmental
service rather than participants in an educational enterprise which
costs them a great deal of money, but from which they get very little
personal satisfaction.

It would appear then that English educators see value in extensive
use of community resources, but view such usage as just another educa-
tional technique. Their orientation is one of exclusivism, i.e., that
only qualified personnel should have responsibility for educating. In
this frame of reference, the school volunteer or even the paraprofessional

is regarded as merely a commodity to be used at the discretion of qualified professionals, rather than as a fellow teacher--an attitude which persists in spite of the fact that non-professionals do far more educating than even the most highly qualified educators.

With regard to the growing cost of education, it is interesting to note that the very things which are costing the most are the same things which the questionnaire respondents voted least important to the success of community oriented English: "computer scheduling," "special school plant facilities," "additional guidance services," etc. Thus, if a community oriented program could be successfully implemented without these expensive extras, but with a greater sense of participation for the citizenry, then it is likely that two major benefits would accrue to the community: greater rapport among citizens, teachers and students; and reduced cost to the taxpayer. Tangible evidence to support the likelihood of reduced cost is provided by the example of the Parkway Program, which began with foundation money but is now sustained solely by the same teacher/student unit allocation as is received by any other school in the Philadelphia system (49).

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of the findings of this research study, it is recommended that educators look for solutions to their problems outside the windows of their classrooms and offices, as Bailey suggests. Otherwise, the profession, while complacently rolling along, determined that solutions to problems can be found "within the system," may, like the "one hoss shay," fall abruptly and completely apart. As educators we should be as broadminded and mentally flexible as we would have our students be, yet there seems to be a general lack of imagination when it comes to finding fresh approaches to stale, entrenched problems that have stubbornly resisted the assaults of legions of hardware and software apparatus.

Perhaps we should not be so jealous of our prerogatives and be willing, as Charles Silberman suggests, to let laymen share educative responsibility with us, for they exert far more educative influence than do professionals anyway. Even if we as a profession could dominate education, such a practice would not be democratic.

In light of the knowledge explosion and rapidly changing world scene, it might be better to regard education more as a process rather than a product, as many scholars have suggested. This would facilitate participation by the lay community by stressing what a man can do rather than what he knows. Knowledge would be valued as a means for education rather than an end. As John Bremer, the former Director of the Parkway School, once said, the purpose of high school education should be to teach a youngster how to

"live learningly" in his life space, then to enlarge that life space.
"In the future education has to be a function of the total community
and not just of a group of special, specialized professional educators.
In my opinion, education is the supreme political function" (49).

What this means for educators specifically is a willingness first
of all to accept the fact that the student learns much more outside
school than inside. This fact is undeniable and will continue to be
so, unless we as a society are ready for Orwellian Alpha, Beta and
Gamma people. The fact that no one group in our society has absolute
power over the psychological and intellectual development of youth is
a circumstance that we educators heartily endorse in principle, yet
the strenuous efforts of many of us to mold young minds to suit our
own interests belie any conviction in such a principle. Who among us
can say with certainty what knowledge should be possessed or what
attitudes should be held in the next century? Who among us knows for
sure that what he does contributes to the optimum development of his
students? We do not and cannot know these things because we are finite,
molded products of our culture; and our perceptions are focused and
limited by this molding. Since we are thus impaired and likely to
pass on a very similar impairment to our students, it might be better
to expose youth to as many adult minds as possible, so as to take
advantage of as much perceptive, comprehensive, creative ability as
does exist in the community of mankind--abilities which are often-
times possessed in greater measure by the uneducated than the highly
educated.

We in the teaching profession should, therefore, obtain the
assistance of as many kinds of people as possible in carrying out

the educational enterprise. That education which must be "formal" should be kept as close to reality as possible. We English teachers, for example, could still share the wisdom and artistry of Shakespeare or Emerson, and the best way to become acquainted with these two writers may be in some kind of formal school setting, but this experience should be followed by one in which the student is shown how such wisdom and artistry contribute to a more satisfying life. In short, Shakespeare and Emerson would have to be made "relevant." "Art for Art's Sake" could no longer be tolerated. Since noble ideas and the communication of them is the main business of English, such ideas and such communication should be sought after in as many places as possible; and practiced with as many different kinds of people as possible. There is very little evidence to support the notion that English teachers or professors are any better sources of noble ideas or communication skill than are other people. Indeed, our minds are often so burdened with the trivia of our middle-class life styles that many of us are less endowed with such intellectual gifts than are many working class people in closer communication with the "warp and woof" of real world emanations, like a janitor this writer once knew whose speech was rich in seemingly spontaneous metaphorical expressions. Once, when describing a high-speed car ride he once had, he said that the telephone poles along the highway had looked like the "teeth in a fine-toothed comb."

It is suggested that, as a major part of their English curriculum, students be involved in setting up and maintaining the communication structure Sumption and Engstrom believe is indispensable to good school-community relations (59). Not only should every opportunity be sought for finding ways for them to practice effective communication in their

community oriented and community situated coursework, but also through such means as having them write school news stories in the local newspaper and in the periodicals of any cooperating church, corporation, etc. They could also be involved in public speaking at social or civic clubs; or in panel discussions on television, in school programs, etc. Inasmuch as the "field trip" or the "field experience" are established educational practices, these could be used as a means for getting the student oriented to the community, for such extensive involvements with the community would be as alien to him as it would be for teachers and citizens. Using such established practice as a foundation, the teacher could elaborate on or alter such practice as would be necessary to realize the full potential of a community oriented program.

The teacher's job would be that of "midwife" in that he would help students to formulate their ideas and develop methods for communicating them. In this capacity he would strive to avoid indoctrinating the youth in any way. He would also be a facilitator in that he would make all the arrangements necessary for his students to have the kinds of experiences the teachers, students, and community agree the students should have. Rapport between teachers and students would be facilitated through the teachers' respect for the students' educative ability; for youth, like any other citizens, do exert a strong educative influence. A young person especially interest in folk rock, for example, should be able to teach his fellow students and his teachers something about folk rock as a modern poetic idiom. Such teaching experience would bolster the youth's self-concept and engender greater respect for the student by the teacher.

The school, then, would become recognized for what it is——a subsystem in the educational milieu of the total community.[1] The English

---
[1]

class would be recognized for what _it_ is--a subsystem in the communication milieu of television, movies, newspapers, magazines, etc; and the relationship and relative influence of each of these subsystems would be accounted for in planning the English curriculum. Since these other subsystems collectively exert far more influence than does the English class, it seems only logical for the English teaching profession to do what it can to make sure these influences work for the purposes of education rather than against them.

It is recommended that this study be followed by others which explore the attitude of the community (including students), with respect to this curriculum concept. In carrying out such a study, care should be taken, in some discreet manner, to assure respondents that their participation would be as partners to the teaching profession rather than as employees of it, for the community's perception of its relationship to the school would determine its attitude toward such a curriculum plan. It is further recommended that follow-up studies of educator attitudes also be made, but with different, more specific information, so that the respondent can have a better understanding of the concepts on which he is to pass judgement. There should also be open-ended or free response questions, so that he can include information and attitudes which are not included or called for in the questionnaire. The ultimate goal of this research would be to determine the extent to which community oriented education is favored by the school and community. This information, together with the results of research studies of the Parkway school and its companion schools in Chicago and Washington, D.C.,[2] should

---

[2] The Parkway School was opened in February, 1969. Metro High School in Chicago opened in February, 1970. A third "school without walls" opened in Washington, D.C. in March, 1971 (_Saturday Review_, April 17, 1971, p. 71.)

determine the value of such programs as a means of eradicating that student-school-community alienation which presently frustrates the best efforts of the teaching profession.[3]

---

[3]According to the "public information officer" at the Parkway school, some of the research the Program has planned will be for the purpose of learning the extent to which the Parkway approach can be used successfully in small communities; thus, the value of the program as a method for general use in the country might soon be determined.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

MAXIMIZING USE OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH:

A SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL OPINION

If you have ever utilized the independent study method with your classes
or are now using it, or have made plans to use it, please mark in this
space.

Purpose

The purpose of this survey is to ascertain the professional opinion of
senior high school English teachers and supervisors in selected Florida
counties*, and of English Education professors in Florida colleges, as
to the practicability and feasibility of an English program which makes
maximum use of community resources; and, from those who believe it is
practicable, to determine what elements should be contained in such a
program.

Definition of terms

1. <u>maximum</u> - choosing to use community resources even though a classroom
    activity would achieve the educational objective equally as
    well, given that excessive expense or trouble is not an
    issue.

2. <u>practicability</u> - workable and possibly superior to the traditional
    classroom English program which maximizes class and
    school activities.

3. <u>feasibility</u> - the workability of such a program in the individual
    teacher's school-community setting (i.e., that geo-
    graphic and psychological area he feels the school
    is "in community with.").

---

* Those counties which contain at least one urban area with a population of
50,000 or more, or form a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area with such
counties (Bureau of the Census definition).

4. resources - teaching aides and paraprofessionals who come to the
          school; businessmen, technicians, and professionals,
          who conduct classes at their place of work (like in
          Philadelphia's Parkway Program); television studios;
          radio stations; newspaper offices; little theater
          groups; etc.

5. elements - those school organizational and program, and community
          arrangements which would have to be made; those special
          facilities which would have to be secured; etc.

Questions

1. Do you believe such a program is practicable?   yes _____ no _____

2. If you answered "yes" to question 1, which of the elements listed below
   do you think are most and least important to the success of such a
   program? (Mark two items "Most" and two items "Least.")

   a. an independent study program   _____

   b. individualized instruction   _____

   c. flexible scheduling   _____

   d. eligibility requirements for student participation _____

   e. special school plant facilities   _____

   f. special learning materials (teaching machines,
      learning kits, etc.)   _____

   g. curriculum changes   _____

   h. a highly flexible school program   _____

   i. computer scheduling and record keeping   _____

   j. additional guidance services   _____

   k. special transportation facilities   _____

   l. a community-school relations director on the school
      staff   _____

   m. a teachers' community relations council   _____

   n. a citizens' advisory council   _____

   o. unified school dedication to the community school
      philosophy   _____

p. unified community dedication to the community school
    philosophy ·   _____

3. Feasibility - mark the statement below which best describes the
                 situation in your particular school-community
                 setting.[a]

    a. The school is more likely to favor such a program than is
        the community.   _____

    b. The community is more likely to favor such a program than
        is the school.   _____

    c. Both the school and the community are likely to favor
        such a program.   _____

    d. Neither the school nor the community is likely to favor
        such a program.   _____

    Mark in the following space if you would like to have a copy
    of the findings of this research.   _____

    _____

[a] The questionnaire sent to the professors had this explanatory note
appended to the feasibility statement:"(i.e., that setting where you
provide pre-service and/or in-service education)."

APPENDIX B

LETTER REQUESTING COUNTY SUPERVISORS

AND ADMINISTRATORS TO SEND TEACHER LISTS

I am conducting a survey for my doctoral dissertation of senior high school English teachers and supervisors in metropolitan Florida counties. Since the research is restricted to senior high teachers, I need only those in schools with grades 9-12 or 10-12. Would you be kind enough to provide me with the names of such teachers and their schools for your county? Thank you.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX C

LETTER SENT TO TEACHERS IN PILOT STUDY

I am a doctoral student in Education conducting a survey for my dissertation on the use of community resources in the teaching of English. Would you be kind enough to answer the few questions asked in the accompanying form and return same to me? If you would like a copy of the findings, just mark in the appropriate space at the bottom of the form. Thank you.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO ALL TEACHERS

IN TARGET POPULATION

I am a doctoral student in Education conducting a survey for my dissertation on the use of community resources in the teaching of English. Would you be kind enough to answer the few questions asked in the accompanying form and return same to me as soon as possible? Your prompt attention would help assure the 80% return of questionnaires necessary for this survey to be valid. If you would like a copy of the findings, just mark in the appropriate place at the bottom of the form. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX E

LETTER TO SUPERVISORS AND PROFESSORS

I am a doctoral student in Education conducting a survey for my dissertation on the use of community resources in the teaching of English. Would you be kind enough to answer the few questions asked in the accompanying form and return same to me as soon as possible? If you would like a copy of the findings, just mark in the appropriate space at the bottom of the form. Thank you.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX F

LETTER TO PRIVATE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

I am a doctoral student conducting a dissertation survey of senior high school English teachers and supervisors in metropolitan Florida counties, and of English Education professors in Florida. The purpose of this survey is to secure the professional opinion of these persons as to the merit of an English curriculum which maximizes use of community resources. Would you be kind enough to assist me in reaching a one teacher sample of the English teachers in your school? In order to assure that the sampling is unbiased, I find it necessary to ask each principal to have his secretary write on the slip of paper attached to the questionnaire packet the name of that English teacher whose last name begins with the letter closest to the letter "N" (e.g., Norris, Olson, Matthews, Phillips, Kelley, Sanders, etc.). For those schools with only one teacher, it will not of course be necessary to make a selection. On the form contained in the envelope addressed to me, please write the name of the teacher to whom the questionnaire was given, so that I might correspond directly with that person should he or she be a nonrespondent.

Your prompt attention to this matter would be most appreciated in that it would help assure the 80% return needed in order for the total sample to be valid. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely

APPENDIX G

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PRIVATE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

On March 31, 1971, I sent you a letter with insufficient postage. I apologize for this error. Would you be kind enough to give me a second chance by accepting the enclosed questionnaire and giving it to one of your English teachers, selected at random? Would you also record the name of this teacher so that I might contact him through you should he be a nonrespondent? Thank you for your patience.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX H

APPRECIATION LETTER TO

PRIVATE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS WHO RESPONDED

On March 31, 1971, I sent you a questionnaire letter with insufficient postage. It was very kind of you to overlook my mistake and pay the postage due. Thank you for your consideration and for responding to the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX I

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS

On March 31, 1971, an opinionnaire concerning the merits of a community oriented English curriculum was sent to you. Won't you please return it as soon as possible, so that I might have the survey concluded before teachers begin leaving for their various summer activities? Thank you.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX J

LETTER TO PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

I am a doctoral student conducting a dissertation survey of senior high school English teachers and supervisors in metropolitan Florida counties, and of English Education professors in Florida. The purpose of this survey is to secure the professional opinion of these persons as to the merit of an English curriculum which maximizes use of community resources.

The chief difficulty I have encountered in carrying out this project is in attempting to secure the names of all the teachers in the thirteen target counties. Of the thirteen county offices, only five have provided me with the requested information; thus, in order to reach the target personnel in the remaining eight counties, within the two months remaining in the school year, I find it necessary to ask for the assistance of the senior high principals in the eight counties. Would you be kind enough to assist me in reaching a random sample of English teachers in your school?

Enclosed are envelopes containing blank questionnaires for the sample needed from your school. On the form contained in the envelope addressed to me, please write the names of the teachers to whom the questionnaires were given, so that I might correspond directly with these persons should any of them be non respondents.

Your prompt attention to this matter would be most appreciated in that it would help assure the 80% return needed in order for the sample to be valid. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX K

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

On April 22nd, I sent you a packet of questionnaires along with a request that they be given to a random sample of your English teachers. Since I have not yet received any reaction from my request, I am becoming apprehensive as to whether or not I can expect a response from your school before the school year ends, if at all. Won't you please let me know if or approximately when I can expect a reply? I would greatly appreciate it.

                        Sincerely,

APPENDIX L

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO THOSE PUBLIC SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

WHO WERE SENT QUESTIONNAIRES VIA THEIR PRINCIPALS

On April 22nd, I sent out questionnaires concerning the merits of a community oriented English curriculum, but failed to realize that unless the teachers put their names on the questionnaires, I would not be able to distinguish the respondents from the non-respondents in each school. Would you please help me reach the non respondents by returning this letter, appropriately marked below? Thank you.

Sincerely,

I have returned the questionnaire _____ and would like a summary of the survey results _____.

I haven't returned the questionnaire but soon will _____.

I don't have a questionnaire; send me one _____.

I am unable to respond to your questionnaire _____ but would like a summary of the survey results _____.

APPENDIX M

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO THOSE PUBLIC SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

WHO WERE SENT QUESTIONNAIRES DIRECTLY

On April 12, 1971, an opinionnaire concerning the merits of a community oriented English curriculum was sent to you. Won't you please return it as soon as possible, so that I might have the survey concluded before teachers begin leaving for their various summer activities? Thank you.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX N

FIRST LETTER SENT TO THE CHAIRMEN AND DEANS OF EDUCATION

I am a doctoral student in Education conducting a dissertation survey of senior high English teachers and supervisors in metropolitan Florida counties, and of English Education professors in Florida. The purpose of this survey is to secure the professional opinion of these persons as to the merit of an English curriculum which maximizes use of community resources. Would you be kind enough to assist me by seeing that any and all English or Language Arts Education professors in your college have a copy of the questionnaire? Thank you.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX O

SECOND LETTER TO CHAIRMEN AND DEANS

Last Friday, April 2, 1971, I sent you three questionnaires to be given to "any and all English or Language Arts Education professors in your college." Even though I read the letter several times before sending it, the ambiguity of the above phrase did not occur to me. Consequently, today I received a letter from one of the deans indicating that he had given the questionnaires to one Education professor and two English professors. Since I intended that the questionnaire go only to Education professors, and since I have no way of knowing whether a returned questionnaire comes from an English professor or an English Education professor, the findings of this phase of my survey stand to have little if any value.

On the slip inside the enclosed self-addressed envelope, would you please indicate whether or not any of the questionnaires sent to you were given to Arts and Science English professors? I apologize for having to trouble you further with this matter. Thank you for your patience.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX P

FORM SENT TO CHAIRMEN AND DEANS

Please mark in the appropriate space.

_____ All questionnaires were given to English Education or Language
Arts Education professors.

_____ One or two of the questionnaires were given to Arts and Science
English professors.

_____ All questionnaires were given to Arts and Science English
professors.

_____ We do not have the information requested.

APPENDIX Q

Supervisors and Teachers Who Indicated on the Survey
Questionnaire That They "Would Like To Have a Copy of
the Findings of This Research"

County	Supervisors	Public School Teachers	Private School Teachers
Alachua	0	4	−
Brevard	−[a]	4	1
Broward	3	13	3
Dade	1	19	3
Duval	1	8	0
Escambia	0	7	1
Hillsborough	0	10	2
Leon	−	2	−
Orange	1	13	1
Palm Beach	−	6	0
Pinellas	0	13	1
Santa Rosa	−	1	−
Seminole	−	0	−
Totals	6	100	12

[a]− = No personnel in this category

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alexander, William and Vincent Hines. *Independent Study in Secondary Schools* (University of Florida, 1966), pp. 20 and 108.

2. Bailey, Stephen K. "The City as Classroom," *NASSP Bulletin*, January, 1971.

3. Bhola, Harbans Singh. "Planning for Change in English Education" (ERIC ED 026 377, 1969, summary).

4. Bouregois, A. Donald. "Community Control and Urban Conflict," *Theory Into Practice*, October, 1969.

5. Burton, Dwight L. "English: Progress and Transition." An article which appears in "Britannica Education" (ERIC ED 035 632, 1970, summary).

6. Carter, Richard F. and John Sutthoff. *Communities and Their Schools* (Stanford University, 1960).

7. Coffman, Rose B. "The Guidance Program and Student Activities," *Individualized Learning Through Modular-Flexible Scheduling*, Petrequin, Gaynor, ed. (New York, 1968).

8. Cohen, David K. "The Price of Community Control," *Theory Into Practice*, October, 1969.

9. Cronin, Joseph M. "One School Board's Response to Community Demands," *Theory Into Practice*, October, 1969.

10. Cunningham, Luvern L. "What Do All Those People Want?" *Theory Into Practice*, October, 1969.

11. Dixon, John. "Growth Through English, A Report Based on the Dartmouth Seminar, 1966." (ERIC ED 014 491, 1968, summary).

12. *Do Citizens and Education Mix? A Community Guide to School* Study. Governor's Fact-Finding Commission on Education (ca. 1950).

13. Doster, William C. "There's a Real World Out There, and That's Where It's Happening, Baby." A paper presented at the Southwest Regional Conference on English in the Junior College, March, 1969 (ERIC ED 027 345, 1969).

14. Essex, Martin. "Getting Through to the Establishment," *Education Digest*, January, 1970.

15. Fagan, Edward R. and Jean Vandell, ed. *Humanizing English: Do Not Fold, Spindle or Mutilate. Classroom Practices in Teaching English 1970-1971*. National Council of Teachers of English, 1970 (ERIC ED 045 066, 1971, summary).

16. Felland, Norman. "English Independent Study--For High School," *English Journal*, April, 1969.

17. Filep, Robert T. "What We Know, So Far, About Computer-Assisted Instruction," *Nation's Schools*, October, 1967.

18. Fink, Newton W. and Benjamin Cullers. "Student Unrest: Structure of the Public Schools a Major Factor?" *Clearing House*, March, 1970.

19. Fischer, John. *Education in America*, "Who Needs Schools?" *Saturday Review*, September 19, 1970.

20. *The Flexibly Scheduled School of 1980*. A Report of the National Seminar on Modular Flexible Scheduling at Wingspread, Wisconsin, 1968, an IDEA Occasional Paper.

21. Grinnel, J. E. and Raymond J. Young. *The School and the Community* (New York, 1955), p. 23.

22. Graham, Grace. *The Public School in the American Community* (New York, 1963), pp. 235-36.

23. _____. pp. 294-95.

24. _____. p. 356.

25. _____. p. 360.

26. _____. p. 361.

27. _____. p. 363.

28. _____. pp. 365-66.

29. _____. p. 382.

30. _____. p. 467.

31. Hanneman, Jim. "Computer-Based Instruction: An Inevitable Innovation." A paper presented to the Fall, 1969, ED 701 seminar at the University of Florida. In discussing this topic, Mr. Hanneman cites James Keene, "Brentwood Revisited: CAI's Two-Year Trial," *Nation's Schools*, October, 1968; Phillip Lewis, "Here's the Current Report on Computerized Instruction," *Nation's Schools*, June, 1967; and John Loughary, *Man-Machine Systems in Education* (New York, 1966).

32. Hansman, Louis. "The ABC's of CAI," *American Education*, November, 1967.

33. Hentoff, Nat. "The Schools We Want," *Saturday Review*, September 19, 1970, p. 77.

34. Hicks, Leo B. "An Experiment in School-Community Relations." West Virginia State Commission on Mental Retardation, August, 1967 (ERIC ED 023 726, 1969, summary).

35. "High School Power," Newsweek, March 9, 1970, p. 63.

36. Howe, Harold. "Community Interest, Participation and Partnership," Vital Speeches, January 1, 1969, p. 178.

37. Jackson, Ronald B. "Schools and Community: A Necessary Relevance," Clearing House, April, 1970, p. 490.

38. "The Kids Invade--and PTA Becomes PTSA (Parent-Teacher-Student Association)," Family Weekly, Gainesville Sun (Florida), March 7, 1971.

39. Kozol, Jonathon. "In Roxbury, Way Out of a Fortress," Education Digest, May, 1970.

40. Lopate, Carol, et al. "Some Effects of Parent and Community Participation on Public Education." ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, No. 3, February, 1969 (ERIC ED 027 359, 1969).

41. Maloney, Joseph F. "Communicating with Youth." A paper presented to the 1969 A.P.H.A. Convention (ERIC ED 035 923, 1970, summary).

42. Melnick, Murray. "Independent Study--A Review of the Research Literature." Hofstra University, Center for Study of Higher Education, September, 1969 (ERIC ED 037 165, 1970, summary).

43. Morphet, Edgar L., et al. Educational Organization and Administration (New Jersey, 1967), pp. 130-31.

44. _____. p. 311.

45. Myers, Franklin G. "A Plan for All Seasons: Independent Study in an English Electives Program," English Journal, February, 1970.

46. Morton, M. Scott. "School-Community Relations: New Issues, New Needs," Clearing House, May, 1970.

47. Oliphant, Robert. "The Locus of Change: Some Notes on Innovation in English Teaching," California English Journal, Spring, 1967 (ERIC ED 034 749, 1970, p. 19).

48. Parker, Robert P. "The New English in England and America: 1958-1968." Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968 (ERIC ED 044 411, 1971, summary).

49. Parkway Program brochures of the Philadelphia school system (1970) and (1971).

50. Parsons, Thomas and William M. Cave. "Toward a Theory of Home, School and Community Interrelations" (ERIC ED 020 526, 1968, summary).

51. Proctor, Samuel D. "Education for Genuine Community." An address at the twenty-fifth annual ASCD conference (March, 1970): A Man for Tomorrow's World, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D.C., 1970), pp. 3, 6, 9 and 11.

52. "A Progress Report: IPI." Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, August, 1969 (ERIC ED 036 147, 1970).

53. Resnick, Henry. Turning on the System (New York, 1970), pp. 140ff.

54. Roaden, Arliss L. "Citizen Participation in School Affairs in Two Southern Cities," Theory Into Practice, October, 1969.

55. Shrag, Peter. "End of the Impossible Dream," Saturday Review, September 19, 1970, p. 96.

56. "Staffing for Better Schools." USOE recommendations on how to use Title I funds to enhance the school staff, 1967 (EFIC ED 034 717, summary).

57. Stolurow, Lawrence M. "Programmed Instruction and Teaching Machines," The New Media and Education, Rossi, Peter and Biddle, Bruce, ed. (New York, 1966).

58. "A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum" (ERIC ED 030 665, 1969, summary).

59. Sumption, Merle R. and Yvonne Engstrom. School-Community Relations, a new approach (New York, 1966), p. 28.

60. _____. p. 59

61. _____. pp. 122-24.

62. _____. pp. 149-50.

63. "Supervisor's Manual: Youth Tutoring Youth." National Commission on Resources for Youth, Inc., New York, New York, 1968 (ERIC ED 034 247, 1969, summary).

64. Suppes, Patrick. "Computer Technology and the Future of Education," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1968.

65. Trump, J. Lloyd. "Looking Ahead in Secondary Education," Readings in Curriculum, Hass, Glenn and Wiles, Kimball, ed. (Boston, 1965), p. 513.

66. Usdan, Michael D. "An Analysis of New York City Participation Experiments," Theory Into Practice, October, 1969.

67. Wiles, Kimball. "Education of Adolescents: 1985," Readings in Curriculum, Hass, Glenn and Wiles, Kimball, ed. (Boston, 1965), p. 521.

68. Wilson, James, et al. "Research for School Board Members. School-Community Relations," Prep. VII, University of Tennessee, 1969 (ERIC ED 034 083).

69. "Workshop Report on Parent-Community Involvement," January, 1970 (ERIC ED 032 165, 1970).

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

"The Anywhere School," *School Management*, December 1969.

Bakan, David. "Education: the Future of Human Relations," *Vital Speeches*, January 15, 1970.

"The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English" (ERIC ED 016 640, 1968).

Berg, David G. "Independent Study: Transfusion for Anemic English Programs," *English Journal*, February, 1970.

"The Big Move to Non-Campus Colleges," *Saturday Review*, July 17, 1971.

Bottrell, Harold R. *Teaching Tools* (Pittsburg, 1957).

Clapp, Elsie. *The Use of Resources in Education* (New York, 1952).

"Community-School Relations," *Encyclopedia of Education* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1961).

Duvall, Charles Robert and Donald Truex. "Computerized Community Resources Handbook: A Joint Project of Indiana University at South Bend Community School Corporation" (ERIC ED 045 481, 1970, summary).

Coppen, Helen. *Aids to Teaching and Learning* (New York, 1969).

Doig, Stewart. "Schools That Turn People Off," *Education Digest*, September, 1969.

"English Education and the Electronic Revolution" (ERIC ED 017 498, 1968).

"English in a Decade of Change" (ERIC ED 025 542, 1969).

"ERIC Documents on the Teaching of English" (ERIC ED 033 140, 1970).

Finley, Otis. "Community Resources in the Guidance of Socially Disadvantaged Youth" (ERIC ED 013 263, 1963).

Gorton, Richard A. "Parental Resistence to Modular Scheduling" *Clearing House*, March, 1969.

Greenberg, James D. and Robert F. Roush. "A Visit to the School Without Walls: Two Impressions," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May, 1970.

Hanna, Paul. *Youth Serves the Community* (New York, 1936).

Hentoff, Nat. *Our Children Are Dying* (New York, 1966).

_____. Education in America. "The Schools We Want," *Saturday Review*, September 19, 1970.

Ianni, Francis A. Culture, System and Behavior (Chicago Science Research Associates, 1967).

Herndon, James. The Way It Spozed To Be (New York, 1968).

Kirschenbaum, Howard. "Sensitivity Modules," Education Digest, May, 1970.

Levine, Daniel. "The City as School," NASSP Bulletin, December, 1969.

Moseman, Verne R. "Brother, You Can Spare The Time," Nations Business, February, 1970.

Nesbitt, Marion. A Public School for Tomorrow (New York, 1953).

"Parkway Program" (ERIC ED 047 063, 1971).

Patterson, Irene. "A Community Approach to Student Teaching" (ERIC ED 019 426, 1970).

"P.S. 109's Man in the Pinstriped Suit," American Education, April, 1970.

Reich, Charles A. The Greening of America (New York, 1970), pp. 390-99.

Resnick, Henry. "High School With No Walls," Education Digest, May, 1970.

Riessman, Frank. "The Struggle for the Paraprofessional: Between the Community and the Agencies." New York University's New Careers Development Center, November, 1968.

Rothrock, Dayton G. "Teachers Surveyed: A Decade of Individualized Reading." National Council of Teachers of English, October, 1968.

Saylor, J. Galen and William Alexander. Curriculum Planning for Modern Schools (New York, 1966), pp. 478-79.

The School and Community Reader, ed. Edward G. Olsen (New York, 1963).

Shapiro, Elliott, et al. "Involving Community and Parents" (ERIC ED 012 736, 1969).

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom (New York, 1970), pp. 71-74, 175, and 356-369.

Simmons, James C. and Robert J. Garvrie. "An Examination of the Socio-economic Implications of the Adoption of IPI Systems by School Systems" (ERIC ED 031 801, 1969).

"Student to Student Tutoring in Selected Language Arts Skills" (ERIC ED 033 136).

"Tapping the Community," Saturday Review, July 17, 1971.

"A Thumb-Nail Review of a Few: a Special Report on Ungraded or Non-graded Programs in English" (ERIC ED 044 398, 1970).

"University of Florida Offers Community Aid Course." Gainesville Sun (Florida), February 2, 1971.

Werth, Trostel Gifford. "An Assessment of the Reciprocal Effect of High School Senior Low Achievers Tutoring Freshman Low Achievers in English Class" (ERIC ED 033 956, 1970).

Weldy, Gilbert R. "Building Democratic Values Through Student Participation," NASSP Bulletin, May, 1970.

Wilder, David E., et al. "Actual and Perceived Consensus on Educational Goals Between School and Community" (ERIC ED 023 939, 1969).

Yeager, William A. School-Community Relations (New York, 1951).

Harris Reed Green was born in Montgomery, Alabama, on July 2, 1933. He was graduated from Sidney Lanier High School in July, 1956. After serving four years in the United States Navy, he entered Auburn University, Alabama, where he graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Education degree in December, 1964. From 1965 to 1966 he taught high school English in Hendry County, Florida.

In September, 1966, he entered the University of Florida where he received a Master of Arts degree in English Literature in March, 1969. While working on this degree, he taught English at Lincoln High School, Gainesville, Florida, from 1967 to 1968. Since March, 1970, when he received a Specialist in Education degree, he has worked to complete the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Charles L. Durrance, Jr.
Professor of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Alton C. Morris
Professor of English

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Betty Siegel
Associate Professor of Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Dean of the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

August, 1971

Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School